

favoring an extension of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of Polish National Association of St. Paul, Minn., favoring House bill 16, for the erection of an equestrian statue of the late General Pulaski at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution of Olmsted (Minn.) Good Roads Association, in favor of liberal appropriations for the Good Roads Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Iroquois Club, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLER of Ohio: Sundry petitions of American Federation of Labor in the State of Ohio, favoring the construction of war vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, sundry petitions of citizens of the State of Ohio, favoring an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, remonstrance of the Burford Brothers' Pottery Company, East Liverpool, Ohio, against any change in the present tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., in relation to the irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Ohio State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tippecanoe City, Ohio, favoring the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petition of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, Richmond, Ind., and J. F. Hill, Hot Springs, Ark., favoring the passage of Gillett-Lodge bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Canton Lodge, No. 407, Association of Machinists, asking that the desert-land laws be repealed—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Typographical Union No. 6, of New York, favoring increase of compensation to letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, for the reclassification of railway clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of sundry labor organizations in the State of Ohio, for the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of various labor societies in the State of Ohio, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of citizens of the Eighteenth Congressional district of Ohio, favoring a bill to increase the compensation of rural-mail service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, letter of Charles S. Howe, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the reorganization of the Naval Observatory—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, remonstrance of citizens of Ohio, against changing the present law respecting second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of John A. Bliss, Canton, Ohio, in favor of the suppression of anarchy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of East Liverpool Retail Grocers' Association, in favor of the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the National Guard Association of Ohio, for the passage of House bill 11654—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. TOMPKINS of New York: Petition of citizens of Orange County, N. Y., for increase of pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Resolution of Polish-American citizens of Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Union-Sun Company, of Lockport, N. Y., favoring passage of bill placing wood pulp on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. B. Gilmore and 28 other citizens of New York and vicinity, asking amendments or radical modification of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of General S. K. Zook Circle, No. 143, Ladies of Grand Army of the Republic, Norristown, Pa., favoring House bill No. 3067, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Branch No. 543, Pottstown, Pa., Polish National Alliance, favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Hagersville (Pa.) Circle, No. 37, Brother-

hood of the Union, in favor of a National park at Valley Forge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Petition of Union No. 43, of Urbana, Ohio, against reduction of duty on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Amos Wilson for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: Report to accompany House bill 13026—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of Swats Post, No. 72, Grand Army of the Republic, of New Albany, Pa., favoring an investigation of the administration of the Commissioner of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of W. Polhlmann, in relation to the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 29, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

### CHINESE-EXCLUSION BILL.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 13031, known as the Chinese-exclusion bill, be taken up as a continuing order at the conclusion of the consideration of the bill that is by order now pending in the House—the Revenue-Cutter Service bill—this not to interfere with appropriation bills or conference reports.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] asks unanimous consent that House bill 13031, being the Chinese-exclusion bill, be made the continuing order after the disposition of the Revenue-Cutter Service bill until disposed of, not to interfere with bills affecting the revenue and appropriation bills.

Mr. SHERMAN. Under the same provisions as now apply to the Revenue-Cutter Service bill?

The SPEAKER. Under the same conditions exactly as apply to the present continuing order. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I should like to know whether this comes as a unanimous request from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HITT. The bill itself is one to which we have all substantially agreed, and perhaps the gentleman from Tennessee is aware that this is a measure of peculiar urgency, as it is to take the place of legislation speedily to expire. We have all agreed to have the measure taken up as soon as possible, and we think it will take only a brief time.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understand that all the members of the committee may be in favor of the measure; but whether the minority members would favor making it a special order or not is another question.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can speak for all the members of the minority; but it is absolutely necessary that this bill be taken up and disposed of at an early date, because, as the chairman has stated, the old law will expire by limitation on the 5th of May next. I am going to file a minority report, with the consent of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

GEN. NELSON A. MILES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

In response to the following resolution of the House of Representatives of March 26, 1902, "Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the House copies of all correspondence relating to, and papers bearing on, the matter of the reported request of Lieut. Gen. Nelson A. Miles, United States Army, to be assigned to duty in the Philippine Archipelago and to be allowed to put into effect there a plan outlined by him to bring about a cessation of hostilities," I transmit herewith copies of all the papers upon which final action in the matter was taken.

Since such final action and since the introduction of said resolution, a further memorandum has been added to the papers by Lieutenant-General Miles, and I transmit also a copy thereof, together with the action thereon.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, March 29, 1902.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 475) to

refer the claim of Joseph W. Parish to the Secretary of the Treasury for examination and payment of any balance found due; and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### SENATE AMENDMENTS CONCURRED IN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles; and the same were, on motion of Mr. BROMWELL, respectively concurred in:

A bill (H. R. 12315) granting an increase of pension to James Cobb; and

A bill (H. R. 2273) granting a pension to Martha A. De La-mater.

#### EFFICIENCY OF REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1025) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service; and pending, that motion I would like to see whether we can not arrange with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to the time to be allowed for general debate in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the demand for time in opposition of the bill considerably exceeds the amount of time which I am about to request be allowed; but I ask that we have at least five hours on a side.

Mr. SHERMAN. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to dispose of this bill in less than ten hours' general debate. Let me suggest three hours on a side.

Mr. MANN. Suppose I suggest to the gentleman that we run to-day. I think we will have no trouble in coming to some understanding about it.

Mr. SHERMAN. As far as I am personally concerned, that would meet my views entirely, but there are a number of gentlemen whose opinions differ and whose votes will differ when we come to a vote on this bill, who desire to be here, and it is with the hope of getting some definite time fixed for their guidance that I make the suggestion.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, I suppose that under no circumstances could a vote be had upon the bill to-day.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, so far as this side of the question is concerned, I think we might. I have not had numerous applications for time.

Mr. MANN. Well, I hardly think it would be possible on any division of time—

Mr. SHERMAN. We could debate four hours and a half to-day, surely. Suppose we agree upon six hours; that would leave an hour and a half on another day. I assume that we can not go on with the bill on Monday, as my understanding is that the sundry civil bill is to be considered on Monday.

Mr. MANN. That is what I supposed. Suppose we proceed to-day without limitation. I think we will have no trouble in coming to an agreement, as the bill will not come up Monday anyway. The demand has been much greater than five hours for time, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not want to be strenuous about it, but I do think we can get along better if we agree upon some time, even though that time be somewhat lengthy. I think I would sooner agree to the five hours than have no agreement at all.

Mr. MANN. Suppose the gentleman agrees to four hours' general debate to-day and four thereafter on some other day, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is satisfactory as far as I am concerned.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to eight hours—four hours on a side—four hours to be used to-day and four at some subsequent day. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I assume it is understood that the gentleman from Illinois and myself will control the time?

The SPEAKER. That will have to be agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I ask unanimous consent that that agreement be made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time that has just been allotted for this bill in general debate be controlled by himself and by the gentleman from Illinois. Is there objection to this request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from New York, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1025) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1025) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the first reading of the bill was dispensed with the other day. The bill contains 10 sections and it does substantially this, and this only: It increases the rank and the pay of revenue-cutter officers, it regulates their relation of command with that of naval officers when the two services are thrown together, and it provides a retired list for the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service. That, in substance, is all that the bill does. The committee have agreed upon an amendment which at the proper time will be offered to section 2, and which is as follows, at the close of that section:

*Provided further,* That such assimilated rank shall not be construed to place any officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service in charge of any naval vessel, nor shall any naval officer be placed in charge of a revenue cutter except by direct order of the President.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question about the amendment?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I did not catch the exact wording of the suggested amendment, nor do I know whether I understand it quite fully without consideration, but I would like to ask the gentleman what is the purpose of the amendment. Is it to provide that in case a revenue cutter and a naval vessel are together under no circumstances shall the revenue-cutter officer have command?

Mr. SHERMAN. He shall not have command of the naval vessel. He will have command of his own vessel, but not of the naval vessel.

Mr. MANN. I assume that one of the two would have command of the two vessels, and I ask to know whether the purport of that was simply to say that the revenue-cutter captain should not be placed on board of the naval vessel in command or whether he should not be in command of the naval vessel.

Mr. HEPBURN. Permit me to read the language again:

*Provided further,* That such assimilated rank shall not be construed to place any officer of the Revenue-Cutter Service in charge of any naval vessel, nor shall any naval officer be placed in charge of a revenue cutter except by direct order of the President.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman further—he has considered the language undoubtedly—whether that language is, in his judgment, intended to say that if the two vessels are side by side, by themselves, where one would ordinarily be under the control of the officer of the other, the revenue-cutter officer in that case shall not command, or simply that he shall not be placed in charge of the naval vessel?

Mr. HEPBURN. It means, I think, that he shall not command in any way the naval vessel. For instance, he would not in any way be a commander of a squadron made up of revenue cutters and naval vessels.

Mr. MANN. Is that the intention?

Mr. HEPBURN. That is the intention of the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Then I invite the gentleman to carefully consider the language, because on a casual reading—of course I have not given it the thought the gentleman has—it seems to me as though that intention was not clearly stated.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have no objection to the gentleman perfecting the language to suit himself.

Mr. MANN. I have a great deal more faith in the gentleman's ability to perfect the language than I would have in my own.

Mr. HEPBURN. It has been submitted to members of the Naval Committee, and, as I understand, it is entirely satisfactory to them. We will modify the language, if it is necessary, so as to carry out that purpose.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that in practice, in fact, there never has occurred a time when the two vessels of the service have been thrown together so as to clash in this matter in any way.

Mr. HEPBURN. No cutter officer has ever attempted to command a naval officer.

Mr. SHERMAN. No cutter officer has ever yet been placed in a position where he has claimed the command or attempted to exercise the command of a naval vessel. The intention of this amendment, as the chairman of the committee [Mr. HEPBURN] has stated, is, as I understand it, definitely to determine by statute that no revenue-cutter officer shall command a naval vessel.

Mr. MANN. Is not that the case as the statute now reads?

Mr. SHERMAN. What harm, then, in inserting it here? That is the intention of the amendment, as I understand it, as stated by the chairman.

Mr. MANN. But the statute as it now reads would be changed by this bill if enacted into law.

Mr. SHERMAN. As intimated by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], if the amendment as proposed does not cover what is intended, I should be glad to receive a suggestion from the gentleman from Illinois to change it so that it will accomplish that purpose.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I assume that this House is fairly familiar with what the Revenue-Cutter Service is. I assume that the general duties of the service are understood by the House and that



gentlemen know that they are semimilitary, certainly at times. The service at present has about 200 officers—202 or 207, I think, to be exact—and has about 1,000 enlisted men. The commissioned officers all receive their appointments from the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The officers are appointed from the noncommissioned men. They are all appointed by promotion. The lowest grade, the noncommissioned officers, are obliged to have a course of two years upon the training ship, which course is in many particulars very similar to that provided at the Naval Academy. I have a statement here in parallel columns showing the course of instruction at the Naval Academy and on the training ship of the Revenue-Cutter Service. I will not read it in full, but with the permission of the committee will print it in full in my remarks.

The length of the course at the Naval Academy is four years, while that on the training ship is two years; but the cadets in the Revenue-Cutter Service are admitted into that service at a greater age than are the cadets at Annapolis admitted.

At Annapolis during two years the cadets are instructed in seamanship. During two years they are instructed in seamanship upon the training ship of the Revenue-Cutter Service. At the Academy they are instructed for three and a half years in navigation and on the training ship for two years they are instructed in navigation. In ordnance and gunnery they are instructed during the third and fourth years at the Academy, and during both years upon the training ship of the Revenue-Cutter Service. They are instructed also in both places in international law. Of course, in revenue law they are instructed in the Revenue-Cutter Service and not in the Naval Academy. They have compass instruction in both schools. They have surveying in both, and in both they have hygiene, marine engineering, mathematics, and so forth. In drill the exercises are practically identical at both institutions, and the hours for instruction in these various subjects are very similar in both services.

A comparative statement showing the similarity in scope of the courses of instruction at the United States Naval Academy and on the U. S. practice ship "Chase," with reference to the preparation of young men to serve as line officers in a military and nautical service.

U. S. NAVAL ACADEMY.	U. S. S. CHASE.
Length of course, four years.	Length of course, two years. (Cadets are admitted at a more advanced age than at the Academy, and are required to pass an examination in purely academic subjects covering much taught at the Academy.)
Periods per week:	Periods per week:
Seamanship—	Seamanship—
Third year..... 1	First year..... 2
Fourth year..... 2	Second year..... 2
	(Instruction in handling ship at sea more thorough than is possible with large classes on Chesapeake.)
Navigation, fourth year..... 3½	Navigation—
	First year..... 2
Ordnance and gunnery—	Second year..... 2
Third year..... ½	Ordnance and gunnery—
Fourth year..... 3½	First year..... 2
English: First two years, and includes history.	Second year..... 2
	English: Two years, one period per week.
International law: Not taught otherwise than possibly by lectures.	(Official documents. Thorough knowledge of English supposed upon entrance.)
Revenue law.	International law: One year, two periods.
Compass compensation (included in navigation).	Revenue law: Two periods, two years.
Surveying (included with navigation).	Compass compensation: A distinct course, one year, two periods.
Astronomy.	Surveying: Distinct course. Fully as much practical work done.
Hygiene: One year, one period.	Astronomy.
Marine engineering, naval construction, mechanical drawing, etc., mechanics.	Hygiene: One year, one period.
(Course very thorough and extensive, necessary to train men for construction corps, engineer duty, etc.)	Steam engineering: Two years, one period per week.
Academic subjects which four-year course renders possible:	Mechanical drawing: Two years, one period per week.
Physics and chemistry.	(The U. S. R. C. S. has an engineer corps, graduates of technical schools.)
Mathematics.	
Modern languages.	Trigonometry: One year.
	One modern language required (at least formerly for entrance).
Infantry.	Infantry.
Artillery.	Artillery.
Fencing, etc.	Fencing, etc.
Boat drill.	Boat drill.
Signals.	Signals (thorough).
Bayonet exercise.	Bayonet exercise.
Target practice.	Target practice.
Gymnastics, dancing, etc.	(No facilities.)
Rigging ship, etc.	Rigging ship, etc. (Very thorough and practical.)

The men of the Revenue-Cutter Service are enlisted for three years and receive the compensation which is prevalent in the ordinary merchant service on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. The duties of the Revenue-Cutter Service in time of peace are, in my

judgment, more strenuous, more exacting, more difficult, and more dangerous than are the duties of the naval officer in time of peace.

The statute provides that the President shall at any time, either in peace or war, transfer the Revenue-Cutter Service, which in ordinary times is under the Treasury Department, to the Navy Department and to service under the orders of the Secretary of the Navy, and in every war in which this country has been engaged the Revenue-Cutter Service has, in fact, been transferred to the Navy Department, and has, in fact, rendered valiant, heroic service, quite as much so, admittedly so even by the report of the minority in opposition to this bill, as have the officers and men of the Navy.

The Revenue-Cutter Service is older by many years than the Navy. It was the naval war arm of the Government for ten years before any Navy Department was provided by law. It is unnecessary to cite the instances of the specially heroic and specially valiant and particularly valuable services given by revenue-cutter officers and crews and boats during the times that this country has been at war. It will not be forgotten—it has not been forgotten—by members of this committee and by citizens of this country that a revenue-cutter boat was the first upon which the guns of the enemy were directed at Manila. It will not be forgotten that the *Hudson* at Cardenas performed specially heroic and particularly valuable service in rescuing the *Winslow*, a naval vessel, when in the most perilous position. It performed this service at the utmost risk to the vessel and to the lives of all the revenue officers and crew upon it.

In a magazine article which I have before me—*Cassiere's Magazine*, of March, 1899—is an article upon the Revenue-Cutter Service, in which are set out in detail the services rendered by officers and by vessels during the various wars. I will not go into this in particular. It refers to the uprising of the Seminole Indians in 1836, and to the services of the revenue cutters during the civil war, and also during the war with Spain, recently closed.

Mr. Chairman, I may print a few paragraphs from this magazine article in connection with my remarks, but I will not occupy the time of the committee in now reading these matters in detail.

That this service is not treated as the naval service, side by side with which it serves, is unquestioned. The officers of this service do not receive the compensation, either in times of war or of peace, that naval officers do. True it is that in times of war they are put upon the pension rolls for any injury they may receive at that time, but at no other time is there any pension provided for any officer of the Revenue-Cutter Service. The highest rank in the Revenue-Cutter Service is that of captain. There is no longevity pay provided for any one in the Revenue-Cutter Service. So that the highest compensation received by any Revenue-Cutter officer is \$2,500, a compensation no greater, Mr. Chairman, than is received by many officers in the Navy who were yet unborn when most valiant and heroic service was rendered by fellow-officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service who are to-day only receiving that compensation.

There are many instances of this kind in the two services. This bill provides that the captains of the Revenue-Cutter Service shall hereafter rank with and receive the compensation, including longevity pay, of majors in the Army and lieutenant-commanders in the Navy. That would increase their pay from \$2,500 to \$3,500 a year. That the first lieutenants in the Revenue-Cutter Service shall rank with and receive the compensation of captains in the Army and first lieutenants of the Navy, or \$2,500; that second lieutenants of the Revenue-Cutter Service shall rank with and receive the compensation of first lieutenants in the Army and lieutenants of the junior grade of the Navy, or \$2,140 a year; and that third lieutenants of the Revenue-Cutter Service shall rank with and receive the pay of second lieutenants of the Army and ensigns of the Navy, or \$2,000 a year.

Now, no longevity pay is given to any Revenue-Cutter officer. I assume it is known by the members of this House that longevity pay is an increase of 10 per cent for each five years of service after commission during the first twenty years, so that at most the compensation may be increased by 40 per cent and no more. Now, the offices of captain of engineers, Chief of Engineers, and assistant engineers correspond with those of captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants of the Revenue Cutter, and these officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service receive the compensation and rank and pay as do captains and second lieutenants under this bill.

Substantially this same measure, the same relief for the Revenue-Cutter Service, has been repeatedly recommended by Presidents of the United States over and over again, and it has been recommended by every Secretary of the Treasury of every party from 1871 down to the present time; and over and over again, in making this recommendation, has the Secretary of the Treasury called attention to the value of the Service and to the justice of increasing the rank and compensation to be received.

The duties of the Service in times of peace are set forth in detail in the regulations relating thereto, and are found upon pages 26, and so on, in the book of regulations. I will not read them in full; but, to summarize these duties, in time of peace they consist in the enforcement of all laws of the United States affecting the maritime interest of the nation; the arrest and prevention of illicit traffic by sea; the navigation laws, compelling all kinds of craft navigating the waters of the United States to comply with legal requirements in regard to documents, lights, steamboat inspection, and passenger laws; the quarantine laws; the rescue and succor of distressed vessels and crews; the drill and discipline of the life-saving crews; the supervision of construction of life-saving stations, and the entire inspection work of that service, the supervision of anchorage grounds established by law, etc.

The duty performed in this service when rescuing crews of distressed vessels has been most important. It has been the saving of innumerable lives and of vast values in property. In their minority report upon this bill attention is called to the fact that these reports are not submitted in detail to Congress. They are submitted, Mr. Chairman, in detail by the service to the Secretary of the Treasury, and are on file in the Bureau subject to the inspection at any time of anybody who desires to see them. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I desire to refer to the statements made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] on the day before yesterday in discussing the rule under which we are now operating. He challenged the statement that the revenue-cutter *Gresham* saved any lives on August 13 in rescuing the *Fraternidade*. The gentleman from Illinois made the statement that a false report had been made in that case, because, as he said, Captain Walker, in making his detailed report of that service, stated that no lives whatever had been rescued. I think the gentleman from Illinois either never saw the report of Captain Walker or else he has misunderstood Captain Walker's statement in that instance, because I have here and I will read the full report of Captain Walker of that service. He says:

*Letter of Capt. T. D. Walker, R. C. S., commanding the Gresham, to the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury.*

I have the honor to transmit herewith, for information of the Department, a report on Form 2015, of assistance rendered by the *Gresham* to the Portuguese barkentine *Fraternidade*, of Brava, Cape Verde Islands, on the 13th instant, near Narragansett Pier, Rhode Island. We were cruising from Newport to New London when we sighted the bark anchored dangerously near to the rocks with a distress signal flying, and we at once proceeded to extricate her. As we approached a second flag (ensign) was placed in the mizzen rigging, as though to emphasize the appeal of the unfortunate people for aid. Owing to the sea the bark was riding heavily, and the captain momentarily expected that his only remaining cable would break. In that event the bark would have been dashed onto the rocks, and there is no telling what the consequences might have been. It is reasonably certain that serious loss of life would have resulted, as the people, especially the women, seemed badly demoralized. The safety of the bark and the large number of people on board hung, as it were, upon a very slender thread, and I feel thankful that our good little ship happened along at the right time and was able to do the right thing. No other vessel capable of sending assistance was in sight, and this made our presence the more opportune. Crowds of summer cottagers from Narragansett Pier lined the rocks, but, under the circumstances, they were powerless to render aid. The officers and crew of the ship did their duty well.

Respectfully, yours,

THOMAS D. WALKER,  
Captain, R. C. S., Commanding.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I can not believe that the gentleman from Illinois had seen that report when he made the assertion that Captain Walker had stated that he saved no lives.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I want to say that I have not only seen that report, but I had a copy of it from the Department. At first the copy did not seem to be a full report, and hence I asked the Department again to send me the report in full, and I have here the report of the assistance rendered by the United States steamer *Gresham* to this vessel on August 13, 1900, in full, tabulated form. It is No. 30. It gives number, name, residence of persons actually rescued from drowning; and in answer to that question, the answer is given "none." This was furnished to me by the Revenue-Cutter Office itself, and is a complete tabulated report of the officer in charge of the revenue-cutter *Gresham*, and he says "none" in answer to the number of persons rescued from drowning.

Mr. SHERMAN. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the officer of that vessel found none of the crew in the water liable to sink out of sight in a moment. I suppose that is what that means. I assume that the tabulated report, where specific questions are put to be answered in the affirmative or negative, simply means that where the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service find persons actually in the water they have rescued them from drowning. And yet, Mr. Chairman, while that condition did not exist at that time, here is the specific and detailed report of what was done by this officer and vessel. Here is a report stating that he found the *Fraternidade* in a very perilous position, found it

liable to be driven upon the rocks at any moment, when undoubtedly there would have been very great loss of life.

Here is the officer's full and detailed statement of exactly what was done by his vessel and crew, and with that report before us, Mr. Chairman, can we draw any other conclusion than that had it not been for the presence of the revenue-cutter *Gresham* at that time many lives would have been lost?

A life-saving crew was stationed near the point, and the life-saving crew were unable to reach the vessel; and, as Captain Walker said, but for the fortunate arrival of the *Gresham* in all human probability a very large number of persons on that vessel at that time would have lost their lives. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to ask me something further?

Mr. MANN. No. I wish to say that I understand the vessel that was rescued in this case—and I have no doubt whatever that good service was rendered, and I never intimated anything to the contrary—the vessel rescued in this case was at anchor, and they were afraid that the anchor chain would break. Thereupon the *Gresham* pulled the vessel away, and did not take anybody off from the vessel at all. They pulled the vessel away and put her at some other place, and yet they claim to have actually rescued from drowning each of the persons on the vessel who were never taken off from the vessel.

Mr. SHERMAN. I made no such statement. The gentleman makes a direct statement that the captain says he saved nobody. The gentleman the other day made the direct statement that the report was false in stating that anybody was rescued, and yet here is the report stating in detail what was done, and the only possible conclusion that could be drawn is that the services there rendered in all human probability did save the lives of many people.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not say that I said the vessel rescued no lives. I made no such statement. I said the report of the captain in charge of the vessel stated that they rescued no life.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is what I said you stated.

Mr. MANN. I have here the report transcribed and sent by the Revenue-Cutter Office, saying the same thing.

Mr. SHERMAN. Saying that he saved nobody from drowning; in other words, picked up no human beings out of the water. I do not know that the gentleman had that report, but I do know that that is one of the reports he could have had. I do know that every facility was offered him in the Revenue-Cutter Office to find out all the facts he could wish. I do know that the chief of that Bureau has furnished him a copy of every document he has asked for. I do know that it was possible for him to have seen that report.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman does not know that, and in order that he may be sure of it, I will say that it is true.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have here the gentleman's letter to the Department and the Department's reply; and on those I state that I know it.

Mr. MANN. I have no question about that. I have received from the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service great courtesy. They have endeavored, as far as possible, to furnish me with all information I requested, except they have told me that certain information not in print was altogether too voluminous to be transcribed, and I have made no complaint about that, because it is undoubtedly true. I have contended here that the information ought to be published so that we might know what the facts in the case are. That was the point. But I say now that the letter to which the gentleman refers does not show that any lives were actually rescued from drowning, which is the report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know that it is necessary to thrash that straw over again. The report does show just exactly what was done. It does not show that anybody was actually taken out of the water, and such is not the fact. But it does show that all of the cables save one were broken, that a storm was raging, that a high wind was blowing, and that probably this vessel would have been dashed against the rocks and destroyed, with many of those on board, had not the revenue cutter come to the rescue.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] will allow me, I will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to what he did say. It having been stated that the report showed that 178 lives were actually rescued from drowning, he said that if we had had a printed report of the operations of this service it would have shown, not that they were actually rescued from drowning, but that the cutter saved no lives at that time. That was the assertion of the gentleman from Illinois. He said that the report would show that.

Mr. SHERMAN. In my judgment it shows that many lives were saved. The report is here, and members of the House can draw their own conclusions.



Mr. Chairman, that is only one of the scores and scores of reports showing service rendered under very much more difficult and hazardous conditions than this; some of them showing, of course, as all such reports must show, that at times the service was trivial, and that often had the service not been rendered probably no disaster to life and property would have ensued. But these reports do show this fact, and the hearings before the committee disclose it, that for years and years the vessels of this service, in season and out of season—generally in storm, but sometimes in calm—have been patrolling our coast, have extended the hand of succor to vessels and mariners in distress, have done so at the risk of their own vessels and their own lives over and over again.

Now, in the minority report—I think I will not go further into those details, Mr. Chairman. The reports in the Department, if they were all published, would make volumes and volumes; they are very, very numerous, and as I say some show very serious and very valuable service and others show service less hazardous and less valuable.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois, or whoever prepared the minority report—I assume it was drawn by the gentleman from Illinois—asks why we do not put the Marine-Hospital Service, the Fish-Commission service, the Life-Saving Service under the same regulations, the same statutes that are provided in this bill for the Revenue-Cutter Service. Why, Mr. Chairman, we do not do it because the law already does it, because the vessels of all those services are now commanded by naval officers who have the pay we are proposing to provide for revenue-cutter officers and the longevity pay as well. If this bill looked to the relief of the vessel and not to the officer commanding it, the suggestion of the gentleman made in the minority report would be well taken, but when you consider the fact that the officers commanding all those vessels in the other services are naval officers who now enjoy not only all but more privilege and more emoluments than are provided by this bill to the Revenue-Cutter Service officers, then we see how misleading is the statement in the minority report.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask whether or not the gentleman is satisfied that the amendment suggested, and which is supposed in the future to prevent conflict between Revenue-Cutter Service and Navy service, will work that result?

Mr. SHERMAN. I am perfectly satisfied it will; but if there is any possibility of its not doing so, we will change it so that it does. That is the desire of the committee who report this bill, and I believe it is the desire of the House, and I believe that result will be accomplished. Now, Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this measure object to it, amongst other things, as indicated by the minority report, because it gives a preference, as they say, to officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service over officers of the Navy.

The gentleman is in error in making that statement, as can be shown by two or three illustrations. For instance, Lieutenant-Commander Fullen, of the Navy, entered that service in 1873. Six years of the intervening service was spent at the Naval Academy. He is now a lieutenant-commander and drawing \$3,500 a year. First Lieutenant Newcome, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, entered that service the same year. He had previously served two years, from 1863 to 1865, in the naval establishment of this Government in the civil war. He served also during the Spanish war in the naval armament of the country, being in the Revenue-Cutter Service, and being transferred to the Navy Department by order of the President. Yet to-day he, as a first lieutenant of the Revenue-Cutter Service, receives but \$1,800 a year. There are 25 captains in the Marine Corps who outrank Lieutenant Newcome who were not born at the time Lieutenant Newcome served his country in the volunteer navy during the civil war.

Of the seven first lieutenants—mark you, Mr. Chairman, first lieutenants—at the head of the list of the Revenue-Cutter Service, five of them served in the naval establishment during the civil war. Five officers serving to-day for \$1,800 a year, forced to perform in times of war every service that every naval officer is required to perform, performing during periods of peace a more arduous and more exacting service, receive less compensation for their service at the present time than a very large number of naval officers who were not born at the time these services were rendered by them in the civil war, and without any hope of any early increase in their pay, and without any expectation or any hope under the present law of ever being cared for in their old and declining years. I have given only one or two illustrations, which, I think, show the incorrectness of the statements of the minority that the Revenue-Cutter Service is preferred or will be preferred, by virtue of this bill, over the naval officers. In the minority report it is asked, Why not put the enlisted men of the Revenue-Cutter Service on a retired list if you are to put the officers upon it?

Why, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, that query might be answered with another. Why not put the enlisted men of the Army and Navy on a retired list? If it applies in the one case it ought in the other; but there is another answer if any answer is needed, and it is this: That those enlisted men are enlisted for three years only. They can leave at the end of that time of enlistment and usually do. Reenlistments are not numerous. Enlisted men are not required to have a technical education, they are not required to pass an examination, and their whole life is not devoted to this one service. The minority report states in substance that the passage of this bill would result in very rapid, unduly rapid, promotions in the Revenue-Cutter Service. That statement is based upon the fact that there are more captains and first lieutenants than there are minor officers in that service.

The statement is not well founded, Mr. Chairman, because I think we are all familiar enough with current events to know that the promotions in the Army have recently been most rapid, for reasons that are well known, and also that the promotions in the Navy have been very rapid. What are the facts about the rapidity of promotions in the Revenue-Cutter Service? There is no captain in that service to-day, not one, who enlisted later than 1871. There is no captain who now receives more than \$2,500 per year. Every officer now on the active list of the Navy who enlisted in that service as early as 1871 receives at least \$3,500, or a thousand dollars more than the Revenue-Cutter Service officer of highest rank who entered the service at the same time.

The average age of the Revenue Service officer when he reaches a captaincy is 50 years. The average of the Naval officer when he reaches a grade at which he would draw \$3,500 a year is 38 years. There are several officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service who are now only captains—and that is the highest grade—who are now 58 years old. There are those above 60 who are on the waiting-order list.

Mr. Chairman, I think that covers substantially, in as brief a time and in as few words as I could confine it, the reasons which impelled the majority of the Committee on Interstate Commerce to report this bill favorably; the reasons which have impelled Secretaries of the Treasury, for thirty years, to advocate the passage of substantially this same measure; the reasons which have impelled the present occupant of the White House and his predecessors for many years to call the especial attention of Congress to this service and its needs; the reason why we are here now earnestly advocating that at this late day officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service shall be put upon something near an equality with officers of another service, under a different title, who perform no more arduous, serious, or valuable services in time of peace than do the revenue-cutter officers, and who in time of war perform services just as valuable, just as hazardous, just as brilliant as do the officers of the Navy.

The history of our country, Mr. Chairman, has been made more glorious by the service of the revenue-cutter officers. There is not one blot upon their record that I have been able to discover, in any spot or place. And for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we earnestly urge the members of this committee favorably to recommend to the House the passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, it would have been a great deal more pleasant to me, from a personal standpoint, to have been able to agree with the majority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the report they have made on this bill. In doing so I should have answered the kind requests of a great many friends outside of Congress who have importuned me, honestly and sincerely, to support this bill; but with the convictions that I have as to the general policy, the objects and purposes of this bill, I could not consistently do so.

I heard the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], in the remarks that he submitted on the rule designating this bill as a continuing order, say that, after an experience of several years on this committee, he has been unable from the meager reports, opportunities, and facilities given him by the director of the Revenue-Cutter Service to understand and comprehend the details of that service. In the remarks that I propose to submit this morning I shall not enter at length into the details, but I shall confine myself chiefly to the purpose, to the object, and to the general policy declared in this bill.

I confess, Mr. Chairman, that in the limited time and opportunity that I have had since being a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate and inquire into this matter, one of the chief facts, and the one that I look upon as "a headlight" in this matter—that sheds light all up and down the line—is the fact that the Revenue-Cutter Service was created and organized in 1790—eight years before the Navy was created. It



was then placed in the keeping and under the care of the Treasury Department, the most powerful civil department in this Government. I know that the majority in their report say that since 1872, to date, every Secretary of the Treasury has indorsed and recommended a bill of a character similar to this. I am not here either to affirm or deny that fact, but I propound this question today: If this bill in its objects and in its purposes, as is confessed, is intended to put the Revenue-Cutter Service officers on "an equal footing" with the officers of the Navy and the Army, why is it that no Secretary of the Navy has been found to indorse a bill of this character? There must be some reason for this. There is something behind it. I know that this bill has been before Congress in different shapes and forms for years past. Mr. Chairman, I will read from a letter of ex-Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Tracy, written in 1892. Remember that the title of this bill is to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. Tracy says:

In reply to your letter of January 20, inclosing for my consideration Senate bill No. 67.

To do what was that bill? Was it to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service? No; to transfer the Revenue-Cutter Service from the Treasury Department "to the Navy," and he gave his reasons why he would indorse it. Is that the purpose of this bill? Is it not in effect, as every gentleman will admit, does not it intend to create a separate and distinct naval branch, different from the Navy, without incurring any of the responsibilities, duties, or obligations of the Navy; and ex-Secretary Tracy said another thing about it. Why, his reason was, Mr. Chairman, that he did not want a separate branch of the Navy; and another was that by making this transfer, by making this consolidation, it would save \$603,895. I read from his letter. Does this bill that is for the consideration of this House to-day propose to make any reduction or a saving of any amount to the Government? I will show you by the figures that this bill will largely increase expenses.

I read now, Mr. Chairman, on that subject from the present occupant of the Department of the Navy, and I call especial attention to this. It is not a question here of the efficiency of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service. There is no question of their having discharged in full the duties that devolve upon them in their line of duty. No question is properly raised as to their courage. All these instances referred to by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] do not touch, in my judgment, what is the real question in this case. The question here, the real question, is: "Will this Congress put its sanction upon a bill that creates a civil pension list? That is the real question—nothing more nor less. Listen to what Secretary Long says in a letter written at Washington, March 3, 1900:

A careful examination of the bill in question shows—

I call especial attention—

shows that it is a step, and one covering considerable ground, in the direction of creating a separate naval establishment, with its corps of line officers, engineers, and a constructor, its rank and rates of pay, its system of examinations for retirement and promotion, and its military honors.

It is important to note that the broad question raised by Secretary Long to the nature of that bill applies to the bill now under consideration with equal force.

This bill does not differ from the one that Secretary Long was talking about, except in some immaterial features. The great object and purpose and spirit of this bill is exactly the same as the one about which Secretary Long was talking, and the same objectionable features are in this bill. Secretary Long says:

It is important to note that the broad question raised by the form in which this bill is drawn and by the provisions which it contains is whether or not, as a matter of policy, this Government should have more than one naval organization, and, if more than one, how many.

The arguments—

Says Secretary Long—

adducible in favor of conferring upon the Revenue-Cutter Service the benefits embodied in S. 728 apply with more or less force to the officers and men of the Coast Survey and the Fish Commission and to the newly created transport service, now a part of the organization of the Army.

Why, the distinguished gentleman said that the Fish Commission had nothing to do with it. It is a fact that in the Spanish-American war there were about 123 acting as auxiliary vessels to the Navy. How many of them were in the Revenue-Cutter Service? Thirteen. And the balance were the Marine Service—Fish Commission, life-saving, light-house tenders, and other vessels.

Mr. Long proceeds:

In the judgment of this Department the questions thus presented are far-reaching, and it would appear proper, before any further steps are taken in the direction of the establishment of a number of distinct organizations, naval in their character, with their necessary staff accompaniment and auxiliary machinery, under the control of at least three separate departments of the Government, that the attention of Congress should be invited to the apparently unnecessary complications which are thereby brought about, and to the patent advantages which a unified organization would afford in avoiding duplication, in interchangeability of duties at all times, and in prompt mobilization in emergencies.

Now, I read that, Mr. Chairman, from these two Secretaries, one the ex-Secretary of the Navy and the other the present incumbent, to show that the Navy Department did not favor the creation of a separate branch of the Navy as this bill proposes to create.

Now, there is another singular fact. These bills relating to the Revenue-Cutter Service have been before Congress for years. The present bill, as will be seen, changes the bill that Mr. Long was referring to in some respects. What are those changes?

Section 7 of the old bill, before the Fifty-sixth Congress, provided that the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service shall have served thirty years as commissioned officers in said service, and then may be retired from active service by the President. This bill we are discussing makes it sixty-four years. It is apparent what objection would be made to the thirty-year clause. A young man 18 years old in the Revenue-Cutter Service would be retired at 48—in the prime of life.

Another feature is changed, and that is section 24, which accorded the Revenue-Cutter Service some "special honors." These special honors that these gentleman at one time intended to confer upon this Revenue-Cutter Service I am glad has been stricken out from the bill. Secretary Long, in discussing the "special official honor" paragraph of the old bill, said:

Section 24 of the bill contains inflexible requirements upon the subject of official honor and courtesies which would put the Revenue-Cutter Service in an anomalous position, but particularly in the presence of representatives of foreign military and naval service.

That section has been eliminated from the present bill. Now, there is another one that has gone out, and I will not discuss that, because I understand the amendment has been made in reference to the present provisions of the bill that fully regulates and provides that a Revenue-Cutter Service officer, even though he has equal rank and receives equal pay as a corresponding naval officer, the Revenue-Cutter officer shall never take command over a naval officer. It seems to me this amendment would smart in the pride of the revenue officer. That is not my concern.

Now, the question is a natural one. Why is it that for so long—such a great number of years after this Revenue-Cutter Service was organized—more than one hundred and ten years ago, and it has remained constantly in the Treasury Department, through all the vicissitudes of wars and rumors of wars in this country, through all the changes, through all the magnificent growth and splendid achievements of our great country, why is it that Congress has refused to pass this character of bill? There is some answer to this. There is some reason for it. Why, what is it? Let us look, now, Mr. Chairman, for a moment at the title to this bill. It reads: "An act to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propound this question, and I would like to hear it answered: In what way and in what manner does this bill "promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service?" Does it impose additional duties; does it require additional obligations; does it make more rigid discipline? Nothing of that kind is proposed in it; nothing of that kind is contemplated. The sole object of this bill, stripped of all glamour and pyrotechnics and "gush" about the gallantry of the officers of the revenue cutters, their feats of unexcelled and unparalleled daring, all of which has no bearing whatever on the consideration of this bill—the sole object of the bill, I repeat, is to make the Revenue-Cutter officers equal to the Navy or Army officers. That is the only proposition. It proposes to do this by increasing their pay, and provides at the same time for the retirement of the officer with the increase of his pay. It seeks to establish, as I said before, a separate branch of the Navy, incompatible, independent with our Navy, not controlled by the Secretary of the Navy, but by the Secretary of the Treasury.

What else does it do? In section 3 of this bill—and I call especial attention to it, for it seems to me it gives valuable information about the purpose of the bill—section 3 provides that the officers of the United States Revenue-Cutter Service shall hereafter receive the same pay and allowances, except forage, as are now or may hereafter be provided by law for officers of corresponding rank in the Army, including longevity pay.

Why, I ask this committee, is the pay of these revenue officers to be estimated by corresponding officers in the Army? Why not put it according to corresponding officers in the Navy, with which Department it is so lustily claimed they are twin brothers? You know that there must be a purpose and an object, and I say that the bill, if it becomes a law, will accomplish that "purpose and object." This bill, in fact and in truth, gives preference to the revenue-cutter officer over the naval officer, and increases their pay above the pay of the naval officer.

I say that this bill does that. Why, it is a known fact, and I will read it to you, that when a naval officer is on the high seas he gets full pay; when he comes ashore there is a reduction of 15 per cent in his pay. Have you heard of any reduction proposed



in this bill for the revenue-cutter officers because he is on shore? The statute says that when they are on shore the naval officers are subject to a reduction of 15 per cent in their pay. Does any such thing apply to the army officer, the captain or the lieutenant? Here is disclosed the "cloven foot" in this bill. Why was the army officer made the standard of pay? Are you willing, when the bill reads "to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service," to put them in an advantageous position over the naval officers?

Now, Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference, in referring to the standing of a cadet, when they entered or did not enter, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] did, in the Naval Academy. The law governs us all.

Section 1556 of the Revised Statutes of the United States says:

Commanders, when at sea, \$3,500; on shore duty, \$3,000; on leave or waiting orders, \$2,800.

Lieutenant-commanders during the first four years after date of commission, when at sea, receive \$2,800; on shore duty, \$2,400; on leave or waiting orders, \$2,000; after four years from such date, when at sea, \$3,000; on shore duty, \$2,600; on leave or waiting orders, \$2,200.

Lieutenants, during the first five years after date of commission, when at sea, get \$2,400; on shore duty, \$2,000; on leave or waiting orders, \$1,600. After five years from such date, when at sea, \$2,600; on shore duty, \$2,200; on leave or waiting orders, \$1,800.

Now, what does this bill do? I call especial attention to it. It not only makes a distinction, but it provides for the officer of the Revenue-Cutter Service larger emolument than that of the naval officer. There is the statute. "Lex scripta est." It does not make any difference, as I said before, as to when the boys enter the Naval Academy; they are subject to and bound by that law. I now read, Mr. Chairman (and I will ask to have it published as part of my remarks), a table showing the rates of pay authorized under existing law for officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service on the active list and on the retired list:

Pay table as authorized under existing law.

ACTIVE LIST.

	Annual salary.	Total.
37 captains, at.....	\$2,500.00	\$92,500.00
37 first lieutenants, at.....	1,800.00	66,600.00
37 second lieutenants, at.....	1,500.00	55,500.00
37 third lieutenants, at.....	1,200.00	44,400.00
1 captain of engineers, at.....	2,500.00	2,500.00
35 chief engineers, at.....	1,800.00	63,000.00
17 first assistant engineers, at.....	1,500.00	25,500.00
18 second assistant engineers, at.....	1,200.00	21,600.00
1 constructor, at.....	1,800.00	1,800.00
Total.....		\$73,400.00

RETIRED AND WAITING ORDERS LISTS.

1 captain, at.....	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
4 captains, at.....	1,250.00	5,000.00
4 first lieutenants, at.....	900.00	3,600.00
1 second lieutenant, at.....	750.00	750.00
1 third lieutenant, at.....	600.00	600.00
9 chief engineers, at.....	900.00	8,100.00
6 first assistant engineers, at.....	750.00	4,500.00
3 second assistant engineers, at.....	600.00	1,800.00
Total.....		23,850.00

RECAPITULATION.

Total active list.....	\$73,400.00
Total retired and waiting orders lists.....	23,850.00
Total.....	400,250.00

Pay table under proposed law for fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

ACTIVE LIST.

	Annual salary.	Total.
37 captains, at.....	\$3,500.00	\$129,500.00
15 first lieutenants, at.....	2,520.00	37,800.00
7 first lieutenants, at.....	2,340.00	16,380.00
15 first lieutenants, at.....	2,160.00	32,400.00
13 second lieutenants, at.....	1,800.00	23,400.00
10 second lieutenants, at.....	1,650.00	16,500.00
14 second lieutenants, at.....	1,500.00	21,000.00
37 third lieutenants, at.....	1,400.00	51,800.00
1 captain of engineers, at.....	3,500.00	3,500.00
21 chief engineers, at.....	2,520.00	52,920.00
6 chief engineers, at.....	2,340.00	14,040.00
8 chief engineers, at.....	2,160.00	17,280.00
1 first assistant engineer, at.....	1,800.00	1,800.00
16 first assistant engineers, at.....	1,650.00	26,400.00
5 second assistant engineers, at.....	1,540.00	7,700.00
13 second assistant engineers, at.....	1,400.00	18,200.00
1 constructor, at.....	1,800.00	1,800.00
Total.....		472,420.00

Pay table under proposed law for fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.—Continued.

RETIRED LIST.

	Annual salary.	Total.
12 captains, at.....	\$2,625.00	\$31,500.00
15 chief engineers, at.....	1,890.00	28,350.00
4 first lieutenants, at.....	1,890.00	7,560.00
1 second lieutenant, at.....	1,462.50	1,462.50
1 third lieutenant, at.....	1,470.00	1,470.00
6 first assistant engineers, at.....	1,575.00	9,450.00
2 second assistant engineers, at.....	1,470.00	2,940.00
1 second assistant engineer, at.....	1,260.00	1,260.00
Total.....		83,962.50

RECAPITULATION.

Total pay on active list.....	\$472,420.00
Total pay on retired list.....	83,962.50
Total.....	556,412.50
Total pay on active and retired lists under present law.....	400,250.00
Total pay on active and retired lists under proposed law.....	556,412.50

What is the result under this bill we are talking about? Thirty-seven captains of revenue cutters, at \$3,500 each, on the active list. The captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service has corresponding rank and pay with a lieutenant-commander in the Navy. The pay of a lieutenant-commander in the Navy during the first four years, when at sea, is \$2,800; on shore, \$2,400; on leave or waiting orders, \$2,000. After four years he gets, when at sea, \$3,000; on shore duty, \$2,600; on leave or waiting orders, \$2,200. So, if this bill becomes a law, a captain of the Revenue-Cutter Service on the active list and with the "longevity pay" will get \$500 more than the highest pay of a lieutenant-commander of the Navy, the officer that the revenue captain has corresponding rank with. The longevity clause, which we saw eliminated here the other day on the floor of the House from the Army appropriation bill, is included in this bill—not to exceed 40 per cent. Let us institute the comparison somewhat further. If the revenue-cutter captain goes on the "retired list" under this bill his pay is \$2,625, only \$175 less than the lieutenant-commander gets when at sea during the first four years after date of his commission. What is more, this retired captain gets \$225 more than the lieutenant-commander gets when on shore duty and \$625 more than the lieutenant-commander gets if he is on "leave or waiting orders." Now, I propose to go one step further in this matter of comparison—what kind of equality this bill establishes. The section of the law read above shows that a commander in our Navy when at sea gets \$3,500; on shore duty, \$3,000; on "leave or waiting orders," \$2,300. The captain of the revenue cutter on the active list under this bill gets the same pay as the commander in the Navy, who outranks the captain of the revenue cutter even under the provisions of this bill. I will not carry the comparison any further. The facts are before you. In my opinion there can not be any doubt about this matter.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman, I think, does not want to be misleading.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Certainly not, if I know it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then he will allow me to say that the difference of which he is now speaking grows out of this peculiarity in the naval service: The naval officers have a tour of duty, say for three years at sea, then a tour of three years on shore, and the lesser pay applies to the latter period. Now, in the Revenue-Cutter Service there is no distinction of that kind; the officers have no period of shore duty. They are constantly with their vessels, unless it happens that an officer is detailed for the purpose of aiding in the construction of the machinery of vessels or some labor of that kind. But in the Navy it is habitual for officers to divide their time of service between sea and land.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. If there is this distinction which the gentleman states, so that these revenue-cutter officers do go on shore a part of the time and the officers of the Navy do, then they ought not be treated as a part of the Navy, and they ought not get the compensation and emoluments and distinctions of the Navy without bearing its responsibilities, its duties, and its obligations, and they certainly ought not get higher pay.

Mr. MANN. May I make a suggestion to my friend from Alabama?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Quite a number of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service are on shore duty all the time.

Mr. HEPBURN. There are 13 or 14 officers who are engaged, as I have said, in the construction of the machinery of vessels.

Mr. MANN. Well, there are quite a number who are steam-machinery inspectors traveling around the country and who under this bill would receive 15 per cent more pay than a naval officer would receive for the performance of similar duty.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. The figures I have stated

have been carefully prepared, and the only answer that my distinguished friend from Iowa can suggest is that these Revenue-Cutter Service officers do not perform shore duty at all, and in this it clearly appears that he is mistaken.

Well, now, what is the pretense for all of this, if you will allow me in the proper spirit to use that word, and I use it most respectfully? What is it? Why, we know that under section 2757—and it has been so since 1789—the President has the right to order these Revenue-Cutter vessels to cooperate with the Navy at any time that he sees proper, or that the emergency requires, and it is for that reason that you are asked to-day, as you have been asked in previous Congresses, to pass this kind of legislation. What else does the statute provide in that, and I call especial attention to it? The great argument here is the inequality while they discharge the same duties, says my friend from New York [Mr. SHERMAN]—the inequality of their pay. Why, a man in this country, in my humble judgment, is not entitled to any pay except that for which he labors and toils. Section 4741 of the Revised Statutes is in words as follows, and I read it:

The officers and seamen of the revenue cutters of the United States who have been or may be wounded or disabled in the discharge of their duty while cooperating with the Navy, by order of the President, shall be entitled to be placed on the Navy pension list at the same rate of pension and under the same regulations and restrictions as are provided by law for officers and seamen of the Navy.

This appears to put the Revenue-Cutter officer while he is acting with the Navy on the same footing with naval officers. I am not prepared to say how many have received the fruits of this benevolent provision of the law.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you during the consideration of this bill have you heard a word said about providing for the seamen mentioned in the section of the law that I have just read? Nobody is provided for in this bill except the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service. That, in my opinion, is a marked injustice. The man, as I understand it, in all wars and in all great emergencies that threatens the life of a government is the private soldier with a knapsack on his back and a gun in his hand. He it is who does honor and glory to his country, and he it is who makes the proud names and reputation of generals commanding. But in this bill nothing is said about making provision for the seamen. I detract nothing from the names of the great military men of our country when I say this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I read first from the report of the Chief of the Division of Revenue-Cutter Service published in 1897, and it is the only work that I have been able to see that gives a detailed account of the expenses. If there has been another, I should have been glad to get it. I have heard it discussed here about the appropriation made for the Revenue-Cutter Service—reciting the fact that the appropriation was equivalent to giving the details, but in this book the details are given, and I would not subject myself to the suspicion of engaging in something humorous and trying to ridicule this Cutter Service if it was not that I read from the book gotten up by the superintendent of the division himself. I treat the matter with the respect and gravity it deserves. I read now from page 52 of that book, and I call especial attention to the caption:

FROM JULY 1, 1896, TO JUNE 30, 1897.

The following examples of assistance rendered during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, are given as illustrative of the character and value of the services performed by the Revenue-Cutter Service in one of its many fields of usefulness—

Mr. Chairman, it is a poor, unnatural creature that does not give the best side of his own case. Ah, we are all biased by our surroundings. In all the courts of the country and in all the relations of life self-interest suggests that we put our own side in its best light. This tendency governs the best of men in this country. I take it for granted therefore that they picked out the very best instances of that which would give character to the duties and the services they performed, and I will read them. I continue:

By the steamer *Boutwell*. Date, January 6, 1897. Location, mouth of St. Johns River, Florida. Yawl *Cocheco*. Home port, Providence, R. I. Number of persons on board, 1. Pleasure trip. Twelve days from Charleston, S. C., for Florida waters.

And I reckon if they had made a detailed statement of the services as they did in 1897, if they had made it for the intervening years, they would have something of this kind in it. Let me go on and read some more of them, and there are not more than a page and a half of them.

Date, April 26, 1897. Location, Mayport, St. Johns River, Florida. Sailboat. Number of persons on board, 2. From Pilottown to Mayport.

While a skiff under sail, with 2 persons on board, was crossing the St. Johns River she was struck by a squall and capsized. The dingy from the *Boutwell* assisted two boats from the pilot boat *Meta* in rescuing the occupants of the skiff, righting and towing her to the *Meta*, whereon the men were cared for.

Do you propose to put that character of service in connection with the magnificent Navy of this country? There never was a brighter or more hopeful prospect in the Navy of the United

States than there is to-day, and the future promises to make it more useful and valuable than it has ever been in the whole history of our great Republic.

The coming future holds out that promise to the Navy of our country, and the people everywhere are in hearty accord, in my opinion, with all of its improvements and the assistance it will have in extending and broadening the great commerce of this country. Why, the history of the world shows that no people have ever had any fear of the navy. It is not a navy that overturns the liberties of the people. It is the man that wears the knapsack and the gun, and that is in the army on the land, the man on horseback, that the people have most cause to fear. Now, I failed to read in that first instance the history of the *Cocheco*.

The *Cocheco*, with two men, left Charleston, December 26 bound on a pleasure trip in Florida waters. Heavy weather blew them to sea. When off St. Augustine, one of the men left her in quest of assistance and is supposed to have been lost. The *Boutwell* came up to her ashore at the mouth of the St. Johns River; took her in tow to Jacksonville.

Let me give a more modern instance that serves to characterize the Cutter Service.

HEROIC RESCUE OF EA'S CREW—TAKEN FROM STRANDED STEAMER WITH DIFFICULTY BY WRECKING TUG.

NORFOLK, VA., March 22.

Captain Guarey and crew of 23 men of the Spanish steamer *Ea*, which stranded and went to pieces off Cape Lookout last Saturday, reached Norfolk this afternoon and left to-night on the Old Dominion Line for New York, from where they will ship for Spain.

The credit for saving the lives of the captain and crew is due Captain Coley, of the wrecking tug *Merritt*, of this city. In order to get at the men, the *Merritt* towed the members of the life-saving crew to the windward of the wrecked steamer and let go, the storm driving them in the way of the vessel, and 12 of the men were taken off and towed to the *Merritt*. This was done the second time, the boat being almost swamped beneath every wave, and finally the remaining members were aboard the tug. Here the Spaniards, not having eaten or drunk for four nights and three days, were given food and water and warm clothing, they being nearly frozen and half dead from exposure.

From the *Merritt* they were transferred to the revenue-cutter *Algonquin*, where they remained until brought to this city.

I naturally presume if a detailed statement had been made, as in the case of the *Cocheco*, that the mere fact that these 23 men of the Spanish steamer were transferred from the wrecking tug *Merritt* to the revenue-cutter *Algonquin*, that this would have been sufficient ground for the officers of the *Algonquin* to have claimed the 23 Spaniards among those whose lives were saved actually by the revenue cutter. If the director of the Revenue-Cutter Service had given us a detailed statement of the examples of assistance up to the present date, as he did in 1897, probably some light might be shed on the number of lives claimed in the majority report to have been actually saved. I presume that if they had made a report on cases of the kind just above referred to, the wrecking tug *Merritt* would have been simply an auxiliary to the revenue cutter, and it would have been advertised that 23 Spaniards had been saved from a watery grave by the dauntless heroism of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service. That is the character of service they perform, except when cooperating with the Navy. I read the duties that the law requires of the Revenue-Cutter Service. I read from the report of the chief of the division, published in 1897:

The duties of the Revenue-Cutter Service, officially defined under the law, consist in the enforcement of all laws of the United States affecting the maritime interests of the nation, the arrest and prevention of illicit traffic by the sea; all navigation laws, compelling all kinds of craft navigating the waters of the United States to comply with the local requirements in regard to documents, lights, steamboat inspection, and passenger laws; the quarantine laws, the rescue and succor of distressed vessels and crews; the drill and discipline of life-saving crews, the supervision and construction of life-saving stations, and the entire inspection of the work of that service; the supervision of anchorage grounds established by law, the patrol and anchorage of vessels at St. Marys River, Michigan, etc.

These are the duties, and now I will state succinctly the objections that I have to this bill.

First, it proposes, Mr. Chairman, to retire civil officers on a pension of over \$200 per month.

Second, its passage as a law will mark the beginning of a policy for the retirement of our Government employees when they reach 64 years of age on full pay.

Third, it proposes a 40 per cent increase of the present salaries of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service by adopting the longevity pay and fails to make any provision for the seamen of the service.

Fourth, the bill proposes to retire officers in actual service and give them higher pay on the retired list than they now receive on the active list.

For instance, captains now in active service receive \$2,500 per year as their salary. Under this bill they would be retired at a salary of \$2,625 per year for life.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him there for the purposes of a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Certainly I will, with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. HEPBURN. I understand that one of the objections of



the gentleman to this bill is to be found in the fact that no provision is made in it for the retirement of the enlisted men of the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I hope I am mistaken about that. If it is, I should be glad to know that those privates are provided for.

Mr. HEPBURN. I want to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of applying the retired principle to the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. No; I am not.

Mr. HEPBURN. You are not?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. No.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then why do you urge this as an objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. You mean the Cutter Service here?

Mr. HEPBURN. To any service that we have?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. No.

Mr. HEPBURN. Are you in favor of applying it in that way?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. No; I am not in favor of applying the retired-pay principle to officers and soldiers of the Army.

Mr. HEPBURN. No, no; to the enlisted men; that is what I want to know. You have urged here, as an objection to this bill, the fact that it does not provide for the enlisted men. Now, I want to know from you if you are in favor of applying the retired principle to the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy and the Cutter Service?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. In the first place, I do not favor the retirement of officers in the way it has been done here for some years past. But I will say this in answer to your question: That wherever you apply the principle of retiring and paying the officers, I think the privates who did their duty should have the same benefits.

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, will you favor a proposition to insert in this bill the principle extending retirement to the enlisted men?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. No; because I am opposed to the entire bill, absolutely and unqualifiedly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then why do you urge that as a reason against the bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I am opposed to it in principle, spirit, policy, and theory—everything connected with it.

When I was interrupted by my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], I was enumerating specifically my objections to this bill. Mr. Chairman, I am glad here in this presence to say that I heard with delight and pleasure a few days ago the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WARNOCK] when he drew that magnificent parallel between the courage and bravery of the Federal and the Confederate soldiers. His tribute was one worthy of the transcendent courage that he so graphically described. It came from a broad mind and a heart filled with noble and patriotic impulses.

I admit that it filled me, as an old Confederate soldier, with pride to hear him speak of those brave men as American soldiers. I heartily congratulate him, and whenever an opportunity and time comes to me to reward these brave men of the Federal Army and their widows no man on the floor of this House will respond to it more cordially than I will. [Loud applause.] That is the feeling I have about it, but I do not believe that it is right in this revenue-cutter bill to advance these officers and give them immense pay upon a civil pension list and ignore the seamen, who do their duty and do the work.

I return now to my specific objections to this bill—the fifth one—and I want gentlemen to listen to it, as I have examined it, Mr. Chairman, with all the care and ability that I possess in the short time that I have been a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: By act of Congress authorizing a permanent "waiting-orders list" in the Revenue-Cutter Service, on which list a captain, at his own instance and request, is placed and receives a salary of \$1,250 per annum. On the waiting list under this bill such captain would receive a salary of \$2,625 per annum. He is on the waiting list by the law, and he gets \$1,250. Under this bill he would get \$2,625 per annum. Examine for yourself the figures I give you. Are you going to do that?

In other words, an officer already retired, already drawing \$100 a month and something over that, unable to perform any service, under this bill will get something over \$200 per month. Paying a man for service that he can not render; taking him from a "waiting list," where he is now, where he is given with his own consent and on his own application \$1,250, and putting him on a retired list at \$2,625. That is the bill, and no one can deny it. The question is pertinent. What reason is there for this extraordinary liberality? And the sixth ground of objection is an important one. It organizes and creates a separate and distinct arm of the Navy, without imposing the obligations, discipline, and responsibilities of the Navy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I see that my time is expiring. The great objection I have to this bill, after these many statements about it, is the far-reaching and dangerous precedent that it establishes. That is what Secretary Long was talking about. It is to-day but a cloud not larger than my hand on the governmental horizon; but it will not be long until that cloud will cover the entire governmental horizon with its dark shadows, and we will see the lightning's flash and hear the thunder roll when it will be too late to retrace our step, after we have inaugurated this policy and created a civil pension list in this Government. The powers will be too strong after once entrenched to dislodge them. They will dictate legislation. Such a policy as this bill fosters belongs to a monarchical form of government; it has not a place in the institutions, principles, theories, and conceptions of this great Republic of ours. It is creating a preferred civil list for civil officers. It creates a pampered, favored class, and to show the drift of public opinion I will ask the Clerk to read the paper which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Philadelphia Inquirer, March 22, 1902.]

#### PENSION FOR SUPERANNUATED WORKERS.

A disposition to make some better provision than the poorhouse for men and women who, after working hard all their lives, find themselves in their old age without any means of support is one of the most salient and encouraging signs of the times. It is a disposition which has been manifested in various ways and in almost every direction; but there has been a more rapid progress along that line of development in the Old World than there has been in the United States, so far at least as regards the intervention of the Government. There are countries where a system of pensions paid by the state has already been established. To bring about the institution of such a system is the aim of the Socialist party in France, an aim toward whose attainment the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry has pledged its assistance, while it is a well-known fact that to soothe the declining years of the worn-out worker and to save him from the humiliation of "going on the parish" has long been one of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's dearest ambitions.

He saw taken in the House of Commons the other night a step, though not a very long one, toward its realization. The aged pensioners' bill, which then passed its second reading, embodies the ideas upon this subject which Mr. Chamberlain has frequently expressed. It is framed in such a way as to avoid discouraging its expectant beneficiaries in the exercise of thrift, and it provides that every working man and woman who shall have passed his or her sixty-fifth year shall receive, out of the public funds, a pension for life, which, though necessarily small, shall be sufficient to insure a decent subsistence. It is proposed that the money required, which is estimated at between fifty and sixty millions of dollars, shall be provided in equal parts between the local authorities and the National Government. And this radical measure, involving as it does a wide departure from all precedent, a measure which not many years ago any British Parliament would have repudiated as revolutionary, was passed on second reading without any serious opposition from either side of the House.

It is true that its enactment at the present session is not expected. The unsatisfactory condition of the national finances consequent upon the enormous drain of the South African war renders the imposition upon the tax-paying classes of a supplementary and avoidable burden impracticable at this time. The significant thing about what has happened is the ready and virtually unanimous acceptance of the principle which underlies the proposed innovation, namely, that the man or the woman who after a life of useful labor is left in old age without means of support has a right to ask that the community shall provide him and her with something better than the pauper's portion, and that the existence of a need for such provision shall not be accounted a disgrace. This is a widely different theory from that which still prevails and which has only lately been questioned. At present public assistance is given to the aged needy, not as a right, but as a gratuity, from whose acceptance humiliation is inseparable. The new view is that it can be claimed as a right and accepted with no more discredit than attaches to the receipt of a military pension.

"The new view," Mr. Chairman, as declared there in that paper, a leading newspaper in this Republic, published in one of the largest cities of the United States—"the new view" is contained, yea, the germ of it lies latent, in this bill which we are to-day considering. Now, it is time, when these things are being manifested, when these evidences are being given, for us to order a halt before we go too near this precipice. Inaugurate this policy, Mr. Chairman, and why are not the officers of the Fish Commission, of the Marine Service, and the various others I could mention, to be added to the list? What evidence have we of this "new view" here in the bills now pending in this House tending to creating a civil-service pension list?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will it interrupt the gentleman to yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Not at all.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am delighted at the position the gentleman takes in opposition to a civil-pension list, and especially that Mr. Secretary Long is opposed to a civil-pension list. How does the gentleman from Alabama stand, and how does the Secretary of the Navy stand, upon the question out of which has grown in this country to-day practically a larger pension list than there is in England, against whom you are inveighing?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Larger civil list? Do you mean a larger military-pension list?

Mr. GROSVENOR. A larger civil-pension list, grown out of the operations of the so-called civil-service law.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Oh, well; I would be very glad to answer my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in any way that I can. I do not know much about that, but I can tell you cheerfully that I have never had much patience



with the civil-service policy, except as to the consular service and some other duties. I believe that when the Republicans are in power they should control the offices. I believe that they are able to find men in their own party that are good, honest, and straightforward enough to fill these offices, and I believe, too, that when the Democrats are in power they ought to control the offices and fill them with Democrats. That is my idea about it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But under the administration of that law 40 per cent of the cost of the administration of the civil-service side of the Government is confessedly a civil-pension payment to-day. Nobody will doubt that, and yet when it comes to pensioning the men who do the service in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the country, Secretary Long seems to be condemning civil pensions.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I am frank to say that I am not acquainted with that feature. I have read what ex-Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Tracy, and Secretary Long both said about this bill, and I agree with them about it fully. I was delighted the other day, Mr. Chairman, to hear that a distinguished gentleman on this floor—and we all take pride and have pleasure in seeing any member of this House promoted to higher honors and a more responsible position—I was also delighted to hear the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], who will soon take that grand portfolio, the Secretary of the Navy, vote on the matter of the rule on this bill in a manner indicating his opposition to this bill. I say I was glad to hear him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, look at the tendency, the trend, of the public mind. It behooves Congress more than it ever did on any occasion at any period in the history of this country to use its power in checking and stopping the increase and growth of that civil-pension list. If it is true, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] says about the civil-pension list that has already been created, then my argument is still stronger, and we ought not to go any further with it. Look at the different bills introduced into this Congress. Here is one "to increase the efficiency of the public service by the retirement of superannuated employees." Here is one for "the retirement of Government employees in the classified civil service and the establishment of a retirement bureau." Another for the "retirement of Government employees in the classified civil service without cost to the Government." Here is one for the appointment of a "superannuated commission." Another "to prevent superannuation in the classified civil service." Still another "to classify the railway postal clerks and prescribe their salaries."

#### REASONS FOR URGING SPECIAL LEGISLATION IN FAVOR OF RETIREMENT FOR WEATHER BUREAU EMPLOYEES.

- (1) They work three hundred and sixty-five days in a year. Their hours of duty are long. On the Pacific coast the first observation is made between 4.30 and 5.30 a. m., while on the Atlantic coast the offices can not be closed before 11 p. m., and often later. They must be on the alert at all times to detect the first premonitions of storm development, and remain constantly on duty in order to distribute warnings that may be received at any moment.
- (2) They are subject to great vicissitudes of climate, being required to serve, as the exigencies of the service may require, in almost any degree of latitude, from Alaska to the West Indies.
- (3) By reason of the peculiar organization of the service its employees are, like officers of the Army, in a great measure deterred from obtaining a fixed habitation or enjoying the privileges that accrue to long residence in a community. Changes of station generally operate to their financial disadvantage.
- (4) It requires many years of experience in the Weather Bureau to become thoroughly efficient in the higher duties of the service, and constant study is necessary in order to keep pace with the developments of meteorological science. The most efficient men are those who entered the service when they were young and vigorous, and gained proficiency as a result of study of the weather conditions as they were daily presented. The observers of the Weather Bureau are on guard to give warning when danger threatens, so that measures of safety may be taken by those whose lives and property are in jeopardy.

And so it goes on, Mr. Chairman. It is already growing up in the railway service. We have various instances of it where they are regulating the retirement of their employees. Whenever you start that thing it is like knocking down a row of bricks—you hit the first one and they all follow after a while. It is tending to teach the public mind first to become reconciled to it and next the Government will be asked to help in it.

I read now from the General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service in his annual report of 1901, in which he says that—this office has been very persistent in its efforts to secure some legislation in the way of relief bill or superannuation act to provide for our permanently disabled and worn-out clerks.

They are all drifting that way. Now, Mr. Chairman, I see that my time has about expired, but I would like to publish, and I ask leave to print some data that I have and am unable to read. In conclusion I have to say that I have not one iota of partiality or bias or prejudice about this matter. I am looking at it from the general broad standpoint, not whether these officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service are worthy or not, not whether they discharge their duties efficiently according to their line of duty—that is not the question; but it is a far-reaching precedent that this bill creates; it is the far-reaching effect of it that once you get it started in this Government you can never stop it.

As I said before, it is against the inspiration of our great Republic, it is against the teaching and precept of all the great men and all the great parties in this country from the time of the organization of our Government down to date. Of all the leading statesmen, none of them have ever, that I know of, countenanced this idea of creating a civil-service pension list. Because the President has the power under the statute to order the revenue-cutter vessels to cooperate with the Navy for the time being, we can not say that that takes from them the civil features when they remain in the custody and under the care of the Treasury Department, where they have been for over one hundred and ten years. [Applause.]

Mr. MINOR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to send to the desk and have read the following resolution:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution adopted by the Grand Lodge of Ship Masters' Association at a convention held in the city of Washington, D. C., January 23, 1902.

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE.

Chairman Committee on Commerce, United States Senate:

Whereas there is now pending before your committee Senate bill 1025, for the promotion of the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service; and

Whereas that service is universally recognized as a most important auxiliary in aid of commerce, in the enforcement of the navigation laws, and all laws appertaining to maritime affairs; and

Whereas we deem it of the utmost importance that said service shall be maintained in the highest state of efficiency: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Shipmasters' Association in annual meeting assembled, That the Senate and House of Representatives be earnestly requested to enact said bill into law.

J. A. WARD, *Grand President.*

Attest:

E. G. ASHLEY, *Grand Secretary.*

Mr. MINOR. Mr. Chairman, I believe that completes the indorsement from every maritime organization of the United States, and they all favor this bill and every provision of this bill now before the House. In addition to these indorsements, numerous commercial bodies, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, national boards of trade, seven State legislatures, and numerous other bodies, political and commercial, have indorsed this legislation. If at any time in my life I ever doubted the propriety and wisdom of this legislation, these indorsements, coming to us as they have, would be ample justification for me to, in my feeble way, support this bill most heartily.

I will not attempt to reply to the gentleman from Alabama at length; but I could not fail to notice a few of the observations that he made while he was on the floor in reference to a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Long. Mr. Long wrote the letter referred to, but it applied to a bill then before Congress, and that was the Fifty-sixth Congress. Mr. Long has never written or spoken a word against the bill now pending in this House. The objectionable features in that bill, if they were objectionable, have been stricken out, and this is a modification of that bill, against which the Secretary has urged no objection.

Nine months after the Secretary, Long, had written that letter, to which reference has been made, his chief, the lamented deceased President of the United States, wrote an indorsement, in his message to this House, of the bill then pending; and it is admitted by all that this is a much more acceptable measure than that; yet the President of the United States committed himself fairly and squarely to the bill before the Fifty-sixth Congress. And I know that if the Congress of the United States had passed that bill the President would have been more than delighted to sign it.

Nine months after the Secretary of the Navy had written that letter referred to, criticising the bill, I say, the President lent his indorsement to the same bill then pending before Congress; and you have never heard a word of objection out of this great civil-service reformer since that time.

So much for that part of the case of the gentleman from Alabama. I was surprised, Mr. Chairman, that a member of this House would squander ten or fifteen minutes in talking upon a letter written by a great Secretary pertaining to and touching a matter that is not before the House at all.

He also spoke of the duties of the Revenue-Cutter officers. I say to him now that the duties performed by Revenue-Cutter officers are more valuable, more complicated, more in number, and require greater experience and ability than the duties performed by any other officials of the Government of the United States. And I say to him, in addition, that every officer in the Revenue-Cutter Service knows that when the President so orders in time of war it is not left to his discretion to say whether he will go into active service in that war; but it is left to the President of the United States to issue his order, and every Revenue-Cutter and all Revenue-Cutter officers are compelled by statute to cooperate with the Navy. That is provided for in section 2757 of the Revised Statutes.

I say here and now that, notwithstanding the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Illinois, the Revenue-Cutter officers stand abreast of the naval officers or the



Army officers. They are as well equipped to perform their duties in peace and war as the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. I say that the instructions and the duties of cadets on board the training ship, and the qualifications required when they are examined to enter as cadets, are such that it can not be otherwise than that they must have the same requirements as Navy and Army officers.

I make the further assertion, and will undertake to prove it within the thirty minutes given me, that all this charge about these officers being civil employees is absolutely misleading. They are a military branch of this Government and have so been characterized by every Secretary of the Treasury since 1872; and not only that, but some of the Secretaries of the Navy have so characterized them. And reviewing the history of this country from 1790 down to the present time, those statements have been verified by the history of our country for more than one hundred years. From 1790 down to the civil war and the war with Spain there never has been a bugle sounded or a drum tap beaten to arms when the revenue-cutter officers have not responded and have stood shoulder to shoulder with the Army and the Navy. Then why will gentlemen insist here in this House that if this bill passes it simply provides for a civil pension list? Such a remark is absolutely misleading.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose to enter into some details that have not been touched upon thus far and to give a history of this service from its inception down to the present time. If the House will bear with me I will read from the record compiled from the statutes of the United States and orders from the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States.

This service was organized in 1790 by Alexander Hamilton, eight years prior to the organization of the Regular Navy. It took an active part in the war of 1812. There is where this service began its military experience, in the war of 1812; and this branch of the service covered itself with glory then as it has done on every occasion since that time.

In the war with Mexico a number of cutters cooperated with the Navy—as many as could be spared from the Revenue-Cutter Service at that time. In 1858 the cutter *Harriet Lane* formed a part of the Paraguay expedition (this was in time of peace), and the services rendered by this ship were the most valuable of any in the fleet, as stated by the commanding officer of the squadron. Many of these vessels cooperated with the Navy during the civil war, as all know, and the revenue cutters were in active cooperation with the Navy during the recent Spanish war, as I will show later. There are, approximately, 200 officers in this service, but by adding cadets the total number is about 220.

Officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service are regularly commissioned and can be dismissed in identically the same manner as officers of the Army and the Navy. They are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They are given rigid physical and professional examinations for entrance to the service, and for promotion to each of the grades above where they enter. The seamen are regularly enlisted for three years, uniformed the same as seamen in the Navy, drilled with large and small guns the same as in the Navy. Of the 229 officers who will be affected by this measure, 88, or over 25 per cent, of them saw active service in the civil war. Without casting any reflection upon the Navy, because God knows I love the Navy as well as any man on this floor, it will be pertinent to remark in this connection that in the naval service to-day there are scarcely 5 per cent who saw service in that war.

In glancing over the minority report upon this bill (S. 1025) my eye fell upon this paragraph:

Under the bill as recommended by the committee, every one of these torpedo boats or torpedo-boat destroyers would have been subjected to the command of a revenue-cutter captain if the two boats had happened to meet in joint operations on detached duty. It seems to us that it would be extremely unwise to place naval officers, specially trained by the Government for the purpose, who may be in command of naval vessels, under the command of revenue-cutter officers, who are without training in methods of warfare, when the latter happen to be serving on auxiliary duty with the Navy in time of war.

I want the House to remark those words, "who are without training in methods of warfare." Now, let us examine and see what the studies are. Let us see what these officers have to attain to—what the requirements are under the law and under the orders of the President of the United States. The studies pursued on board the *Chase*, and that, by the way, is the training ship for revenue-cutter cadets, are of a strictly technical character and are such as to fit the cadets for their duties as revenue-cutter officers. The course lasts two years, and it embraces the following subjects, the regular officers of the service being the instructors. We do not have to go outside to hire professors; we furnish our own professors. The revenue-cutter officer is the teacher. Now, what does it teach these cadets?

Seamanship, practical and theoretical; nomenclature, wooden and steel vessels; rules of the road; law of storms; sailing and

handling of small boats; composition and official correspondence; lectures on professional subjects; navigation, practical and theoretical; nautical surveying, practical and theoretical; magnetism of iron vessels; compensation of the compass; charts and tide tables; piloting; international law, if you please; artillery drill—mark you, artillery drill for these "civilians," so called; mathematics; plane and spherical trigonometry; gunnery (for these "civil" employees, as we are asked to believe them so be), practical and theoretical; infantry tactics.

Who would have thought it? Who would have supposed this was the curriculum, in view of the remarks that have been made by gentlemen who oppose this bill? Target practice, large and small guns; broadsword exercise—who would have believed that? What becomes of civilian theory? Then comes astronomy; laws relating to navigation; signals, service and international codes; fencing; pistols; hygiene; first aid to the injured; resuscitation of the apparently drowned; minor surgery and the practical use of drugs, and I believe nearly everything is taught aboard the *Chase* that is taught in the Navy except dancing. They do teach dancing in the Navy. We have never adopted it in the Revenue-Cutter Service; we make the other fellow dance when we meet him in armed conflict at sea. [Applause.]

Now, here follows the studies. Length of course in Naval Academy, four years, and two years at sea, and at this point I desire to call attention to the fact that revenue-cutter cadets are much more advanced in their studies when they enter the service as cadets than naval cadets. I remember last year in the appointment of a cadet to Annapolis. I ordered a competitive examination, and the boy that passed and took the highest prize out of seven would have failed in an examination for cadet in the Revenue-Cutter Service; but when that boy went to Annapolis he passed with high honors. But these cadets must have a college education, or, in other words, they must be just about as far advanced when they apply as cadets and have their examination as the cadets that have been at Annapolis for two years at least.

And then, in addition to this, they must go aboard to the training ship *Chase* for two years. And, gentlemen, I desire to say to this House that if I had a son for whom I desired a high education and practical instruction to meet the tides of life, to stem the adverse currents that we are called upon to stem in business and in other affairs of a practical nature, I would say that if he could enter this service as a cadet and go aboard of the *Chase* for two years and receive this instruction, that he would be fitted for any walk in life, except the great professions that require special training.

Candidates for appointment as cadets must be graduates of a college or first-class high school. Their examination is more severe than for entrance to the Naval Academy. The following subjects are enumerated, and they must be proficient in these subjects:

Spelling, geography, history and Constitution of the United States, grammar, composition and rhetoric, arithmetic, algebra, trigonometry, logarithms, chemistry, general information.

Now, that is the starting point in this Service. The cadet must pass a creditable examination in these studies, and then, in addition to this, he must take his two years' training aboard the training ship *Chase*. And I am told by disinterested persons, who are competent to judge, and who have boarded that ship, that there is no ship afloat where the discipline is more strict and the requirements more severe than aboard of that training ship *Chase*. In view of these studies, and in view of all other requirements—proficiency in target practice, in the handling of rifled cannon, in pistol shooting, cutlass, rifle, and infantry drills—I am surprised that some of these gentlemen do not propose to disarm these "civilians," so called, and take their arms from them, to take the big guns from off the ships and arm them with tooth picks and bologna sausages. [Laughter.]

Why, it is ridiculous to make such charges on this floor, that these officers are civilian employees. It seems so strange that this great Government of ours will put aboard of the *Gresham*, for instance, 100 rifles, 100 revolvers, 100 sabers, and 4 rifled cannon, with these so-called "civilians" to handle them. It is strange, indeed, is it not?

Engineer officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service are unlike engineers in the merchant service. It has been charged that they are better paid than the engineers in the merchant service. I am here to deny that proposition, and I am ready to furnish the proofs.

The engineers in this service must be better equipped than engineers in the merchant service, inasmuch as they are required to be graduates of technical colleges when they enter the lowest grades in this service. Moreover, they may at any time be detailed to design and superintend the construction or repairs of machinery of the revenue cutters, and they must be qualified to respond when called. They are also detailed to inspect all the materials entering into the construction of the hulls, machinery, and equipments of the vessels of the service. All machinery is



designed by officers of the service themselves, and they receive no assistance from outside experts, as is the case with merchant vessels. On board ship they must drill the men in their force. Now, think of it, in view of what has been asserted by the opposition, the engineer force, if you please, must be drilled in the handling of large and small guns. What is the matter with these civilians again! And they must be drilled in the various evolutions which are required on armed vessels of the Government.

It will be proper for me to say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that the engineers of the Revenue-Cutter Service are just as efficient, and I have it from high sources in the Navy that some of them are more efficient than the average engineer in the naval service. These men, who are drawing the magnificent sum of \$1,800 a year, and some only \$1,500, are able to take the material from which the engines and boilers are made, in its crudest state—pig iron, if you please—and convert it into steel, and by their drafts and designs convert it into engines and boilers, air pumps, condensers, and propeller wheels, and they do it themselves, without calling outside assistance. They can determine its tensile strength, its ductility, and everything about it, and they know when it is fit to go into this machinery. They do not have to go to an expert or professor to teach them that duty.

How often in the merchant service do you find an engineer who is even capable of setting up an engine in proper shape? It is not expected of them. Even after the engine is constructed not one out of ten of them can put it into the boat so as to get the best results. And yet, Mr. Chairman, many of these engineers in the merchant service are receiving to-day, right on the lake which is in front of the district represented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], greater compensation than some of these officers on board our cutters.

Now, gentlemen, this idea of their being inspectors of the life-saving stations has already been exploited. We know there is no question but what the Life-Saving Service owes its efficiency to the revenue-cutter officers. I have stations in my district; I have a station within 4 miles of my own home, and I know that regularly twice a year a first lieutenant of this service comes there to drill and practice with that crew, and I know that if he did not come that service would not be as efficient as it is, though I think that station has the best captain and crew I ever saw.

Now, as to the armament of revenue cutters. The vessels in the Revenue-Cutter Service and the naval vessels are the only classes of Government ships which are armed; and yet I heard the gentleman say yesterday, while opposing the rule to consider this bill, that light-house boats and marine-hospital boats were on all fours with the Revenue-Cutter Service, and that they formed a part of the blockading fleet off Santiago and Habana. Let me state to the gentleman that there were revenue cutters there, and every revenue cutter was under a revenue-cutter officer, and every light-house boat and hospital boat was commanded by a naval officer detailed for that purpose. There is the difference.

They never expected that a revenue cutter should be under any other command than a revenue-cutter officer. He is equipped at all times for peace or war. He reads the signals from the flag-ship and follows the evolutions as directed, and he fights like an American citizen for his country and its flag. Every revenue cutter is provided with rapid-fire guns of the most improved type. Each vessel is fitted with a magazine. In the magazine are modern rifles, a cutlass, and a Colt's navy revolver for each man in the crew, and they are taught how to use them effectually in time of war. In the Spanish-American war the revenue cutters which cooperated with the Navy carried a total of 61 large guns.

Now, let me stop right here to remark in the gentleman's opposition to the rule to consider this bill he was very careful not to mention anything about these boats that were cooperating with the Army. I find that in addition to the cutters that were cooperating with the Navy and carrying 61 large guns that 7 revenue cutters were cooperating with the Army, carrying 13 guns, which the gentleman purposely, carelessly, or unintentionally omitted from his statement. The larger cutters are fitted with a 15-inch torpedo tube, and in a very short time, on account of their great speed, can be fitted up as torpedo boats, and when thus fitted they do not have to detail a naval officer to command them. These modern revenue cutters are the fastest vessels of their size and type in the country. They average from 5 to 7 knots an hour faster than vessels of the same size in the Navy.

And, further, illustrating the competency of these revenue-cutter officers, they design their vessels, they inspect the materials that enter into them, they supervise their construction, they have the selection of the material that goes into the engines, they design them, they draft them, and supervise their construction, and put them into the boat when completed, and not one has ever failed to meet the requirements set forth in the specifications. In the views of the minority it was stated that the revenue cutters cooperate with the Navy only in time of war. Such is not the

fact, as they have frequently been put in cooperation with the Navy in peace times, notably in the Bering Sea patrol and in the joint cooperation for the suppression of filibustering along the southern coasts prior to the Spanish war. During the Spanish war such cutters as were not cooperating with the Navy were detailed to cooperate with the Army, and did very efficient work in the guarding and patrolling of the submarine-mine fields which were located in all the principal harbors.

I desire to speak just for a moment of one of the officers in that service, as I think his name will be familiar enough, and the House will agree with me that he is entitled to some consideration. I speak of Lewis N. Stodder, who was a master in the Navy during the civil war, who volunteered to pilot the *Monitor* during her memorable fight with the *Merrimac*, and to Stodder's skill as a pilot on this floating fighting machine much is due for the victory won that day. He is the sole surviving officer of that historic vessel, and is at present a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service, on duty in New York City, as supervisor of anchorages. And I might say right here in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that until two years ago another officer of this service (Lieutenant Howard) distinguished himself in the civil war, but he died two years ago, covered with glory and filled with patriotism, and always ready to meet the demands of his country in peace or in war. I desire to say also that there is now in the Revenue-Cutter Service a lieutenant who was an assistant engineer on the *Merrimac* during her conflict with the *Monitor*, and he is a brave and worthy officer.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I have briefly outlined the history of this service, and if I have stated it correctly, I ask any man how he can consistently characterize it as a civil-service branch of this Government? I say now and here that it is a part of the military force of this country, and so long as the Navy and the Army have been given the distinguished honor and emolument that accrue to them by reason of the retired list, I say you can not consistently deny the same honor and the same advantage to the revenue-cutter officers. You talk to me about these officers being civilians. They are civilians in time of peace in a way, and so are the naval officers, as well as the Army officers. Thank God we are not always at war. We are a nation of peace, but when war comes we are mighty, either in the Army or the Navy or the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. MINOR. Why, certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. It is a fact, is it not, that the nature and the character of the Revenue-Cutter Service have not changed since it was organized in 1790?

Mr. MINOR. No. I said "No." I want to qualify that. It has changed to meet conditions as they arose. Originally, in 1790, the cutters were sailing boats, small sloops, and two-masters, 100 or 150 tons burden. To-day they are steamships; some of them measure 1,400 tons and are able to travel 20 miles an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MINOR. It has been asserted here, Mr. Chairman, that these revenue-cutter officers are amply paid for services rendered. It is said in the minority report that the duties are not laborious, not arduous, not extremely dangerous. I assert that all that is wrong and misleading; but granting that it may be so for the sake of argument, I desire to say that I had occasion last night to go through what is called the Blue Book, where all the employees of the Treasury Department are listed and their salaries given. Now, I do not want to reduce the salary of a single employee of the Government. I know what it costs to live in Washington. I have been here eight years with a family, and there is no place like it. They will beat you by day and they will beat you by night. It is a skin game from start to finish. [Laughter.] Therefore I have no desire to cut down the salary of a single person of the Treasury Department; but this will, I think, strike the House as remarkable.

I took up the list of female clerks in that Department, and Lord knows I love them all and have no desire to see their salaries cut, and they know it [laughter].

Mr. DAHLE. Even if they are 80 years old.

Mr. MINOR. Yes; age makes no difference for purposes of this discussion. [Laughter.] Now, I found one receiving \$1,800, or the same as a first lieutenant or chief engineer of this service. A first lieutenant, who takes charge of the machinery aboard one of these great cutters that is armed to the teeth, and who is responsible for the lives of these men; who goes to sea and stays there nine-tenths of the time, and who is an able and efficient officer, able not only to command one ship but to command a fleet of them, he receives the same pay as this one woman does, who works in a comfortable office about six hours each day. I found



32 women receiving \$1,600, \$100 more than a second lieutenant or a first assistant engineer. Think of it! The second lieutenant, under the rules and regulations, is required to step upon the bridge of one of these cutters and take her to any port in the world where there is water enough to float her. He is responsible for the property, responsible for the lives of the people aboard of his ship, and yet he receives less pay than each of these 32 women.

Then there are 105 of these ladies receiving \$1,400 a year, or \$200 more than a third lieutenant or a second assistant engineer. Think of it! A second assistant engineer or a third lieutenant, nominated by the President for life, confirmed by the Senate, adorned with shoulder straps, which I know is objectionable to some people, but they are an honor to their country, and they stay in that service and perform substantially the same duty as the Army officers and the same as the naval officers. I find also that 224 ladies receive \$1,200 a year, or the same as a third lieutenant and a second assistant engineer. I say the time has come when some measure of justice, so long withheld, should be meted out to these men. They are patriots; they are efficient men; they are educated men; they deserve well at your hands. They have always bared their breasts to the leaden hail in time of war; they have ever been ready and willing to protect this country and its flag. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, the title of this bill is "To promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service," and such is its purpose. I am in sympathy with the suggestion made by Secretary Long in his letter to this committee last year, where he says that this service ought to be a part of the Navy. I believe that one of the evils of this Government, and a growing evil, is the duplication of bureaus—the duplication of material and officers of all kinds. I never could understand, indeed it was a revelation to me to know that a service of this character, both of the magnificence and strength of the revenue-cutter boats, armed with guns and appliances, fit to wage battle against any fleet, was a part of the Treasury Department of this Government.

It seems to me to be an anomaly that this should be under the control of the Treasury of the United States, which results and must result in a duplication of armament, in a duplication of supplies, in a duplication of material, and in a duplication of men. And while I might more readily favor and support a measure which joined this with the service to which it naturally belongs, in my judgment, that we might have a greater, a grander, and a larger and stronger Navy under one single and controlling head, and that while I believe much is lost of the efficiency and of power in the disputes and contentions as to what officer shall control and what policy shall prevail, at the same time, in the investigation I have given this subject, I have become satisfied that this service of our Government has not received fair treatment; and I am satisfied that this bill will in a measure at least right the wrong that has been done to those who, I believe, are our best educated, best trained, and most efficient men.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I will.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman referred a moment ago to the immense size of the revenue cutters. May I ask him if he has informed himself of the size of the vessels of the Revenue-Cutter Service?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I do not pretend to have the accurate and technical information that the gentleman from Chicago has. I have not had an opportunity to confer with the gentleman, but in a general way—

Mr. MANN. I am giving you that opportunity now.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Yes, sir; I appreciate it; and I thank the gentleman kindly for this school of information. But in a general way I have some information on the subject; and I have gained some from the report submitted to accompany this bill, which says that the boats of the revenue service now being constructed are of substantially the same strength, the same size, and the same efficiency as the great boats that are being built for the Navy.

Mr. MANN. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the Official Register—

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I have that "Blue Book." I have had sufficient influence to secure a copy, and have acquainted myself somewhat with the information therein contained. But I will permit the gentleman to put that in his speech when his time comes.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman does not care to have it in his speech, as it might break the symmetry of his remarks.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Well, I expect everybody will read your speech and very few will read mine. Therefore the country will be far better served if the gentleman will embody it in his speech, where the country will see it. I appreciate the gentleman's kindly generosity and thank him for it, and trust that he will now be content to let me proceed.

Mr. MANN. I simply wished to know whether the gentleman was proceeding in his attitude toward this bill on the theory that the revenue-cutter vessels are of the same size and power as the naval vessels, because I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the largest vessel in the Revenue-Cutter Service is of less than 900 gross tons, which would hardly fill the space of a coal apartment in a naval vessel.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Well, I have seen a number of big men who did not do a big amount of work, and I have seen some small men and some small boats that were fully ready for effective duty, as I will show farther on.

Mr. MANN. I do not question that.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. It is not the size of a boat or the size of a navy or the size of a man that actually controls this question. It is the efficiency of the Service that I talk for, and I want to say that, in my judgment, this Service and the men that are in it, who are as honorable men as there are in our country, have been shamefully overlooked, misused, and snubbed, socially and every other way, by the men of the Navy, who want them to become and be subordinate to them.

I want to say another thing. They may not have as large boats under their command, and they have not as large salaries, I am sure. They may not have as much influence, and an order recently went out from the Treasury Department that they should not even write a letter or have a conference with a Congressman or any other representative of the Government looking toward the betterment of their condition. But while it may be true that they do not sail such large boats, do not stand so high socially, I want to say that no member of this organization ever objected to the promotion in the ranks of a young man who was efficient and in every way qualified for the place simply and solely on the ground that he did not have the social culture, the social standing, and the social refinement to entitle him to the place.

One of the evils of our Navy, and of our Army, too, is this social aristocracy. [Applause.] I do not care whether a man belongs to the Army or the Navy or the Revenue-Cutter Service, the official who says—and puts it in black and white—that a man shall not be promoted because of his want of family, because of his want of social refinement or standing, expresses ideas that are abhorrent to the growth and the dignity and the honor of American manhood. [Applause.]

While these men on this Service may not man as large boats as the gentlemen of the Navy, I want to say to you that they are manning boats; they are not in command of office desks. I wish I might embody in my remarks this cartoon that appeared in the Post yesterday morning of your gentlemen of the Navy sailing the seas on office desks, seated in easy chairs, entitled the "Squadron that Sweeps the Spoils."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. May I have five or ten minutes more?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly; I will yield the gentleman ten minutes more.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. And I for one, while it is in my mind, was pleased that the President of the United States in his message saw fit to call the attention of Congress to this evil of men in the Navy and Army holding civil positions; men educated at Government expense to fight the battles of the country seated to-day in Washington and other places behind mahogany desks, in easy chairs, drawing the salaries of civilians; and I honor the President for that part of his message in which he says it is their duty to get out upon the seas and to follow the fortune or the fate of the flag. Statistics furnished me show 585 graduates of West Point and Annapolis to-day holding civil positions. Now, my friend from Chicago, I ask you to name a man who was ever in the Revenue-Cutter Service who holds a place behind any office desk in this world.

Mr. MANN. You do not really want it, do you?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I could not live if you did not give it to me.

Mr. MANN. Because there are quite a number of them.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I have another argument that appeals to me in favor of this service. Perhaps by reason of my birth and early training I am a man of peace. I should be a man of peace, and I always hope to be a man of peace. It was the doctrine of my father and mother and for generations before them. I may have fallen a little from the high estate of the honest Quaker, but I still cling to the old faith of peace on earth and good will toward men.

Now, the sole purpose of the Navy and the sole purpose of the Army is to take life. The purpose of this Department, except when commanded by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to do so, is the business of saving life. They are engaged in the undertaking of taking life only at such times as the perils of war warrant their being called into service. For this reason I am able and willing and pleased to support this bill.



Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Does the Navy take life at any other time? You say these people take life only when it is necessary. Does the Navy take life at any other time?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. No; I think not. I would not imagine they did.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I thought you were arguing that it did.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. No, sir; they do not take life except in time of war, but I have yet to learn that they of the Navy ever went out into storms hunting for chances to save life. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERMAN. And they do not take their lives in their hands at any other time.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. No; it is not a perilous business. [Laughter.] The safest business in all this world is to be a high officer in the Navy of the United States. [Laughter and applause.] It always has been safe, and it will be a good deal safer since our last brush with Spain, because, in my judgment, there will be no people on the face of the earth that will ever get within gunshot of us again. [Applause.]

But what I was going to suggest was that I want to call attention to some of the appropriations of Congress for these two Departments that do nothing but take life and some of the appropriations for this Department which does nothing but save life. Now, the appropriation for this Department is a little over a million dollars. In 1894 we appropriated something over twenty-four millions for the Army; in 1895, twenty-five millions; in 1896, twenty-three millions; in 1897, twenty-four millions, and so on—I will supply the figures later—in 1900, eighty millions; in 1901, one hundred and fourteen millions; in 1902, one hundred and fifteen millions.

Now, let us turn to the Navy: In 1894 we appropriated twenty-two millions; in 1895, twenty-five millions; in 1896, twenty-nine millions; in 1897, thirty millions; in 1898, thirty-three millions; in 1899, fifty-six millions; in 1900, forty-eight millions; in 1901, sixty-one millions, and over seventy millions by the last Congress. Now, I submit that it is a better policy to appropriate large sums for this Department that saves life. Now, what do the officers say? These great boats of the Navy go out onto the deep sea; they are out in midocean, where in reality there is little danger.

They patrol and police the far-out waters. These revenue cutters hug the shore, the rocky places, the shoals, and the places of danger. That is where these men are to be found, and I want to call attention to and make as a part of my remarks the statement made by Admiral Melville in speaking of this service. He says:

Although the Revenue-Cutter Service is, under existing law, under the cognizance of the Treasury Department, yet it is, always has been, and must necessarily be a military maritime organization. The service by law is made to enforce every statute that pertains to the protection of the country.

That is the business of this department. They patrol the coast for those who are violating the revenue laws, who are violating any of the laws of our country. This great Navy, for which we appropriate such large sums, is simply brought into requisition for actual service and actual good in times of war, except that I believe it is our duty to have a large Navy, a strong Navy, and a strong force, to be able to assert our rights and to maintain the dignity of the country at all times.

It is strikingly significant that just as soon as war is declared the service is practically drafted into the Navy and incurs every danger and peril that the regular men-of-war are subjected to. Does it not seem paradoxical that the men and ships of this organization are presumed to be in condition to be drafted at immediate call to the work of war and yet be not disciplined enough to fulfill the duties of the Navy in time of peace.

Such are the words of the man who knows what he is talking about. These men who are patrolling the seas, collecting the revenues, boarding boats, and looking after the interests of the Government, are expected to be sufficiently efficient on a moment's notice to take charge of their boats, to man the guns, to fight the battles of our country; and yet the minority here say that in times of peace they should not rank with the Navy.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to this:

The ships that have been constructed during the past five years for this service will compare very favorably, in speed and armament, with the best of the Navy gunboats.

For over forty years I have seen the ships and known the men of the Revenue-Cutter Service. I have watched these vessels leave port upon the approach of a gale to patrol the coast in the hope of rendering assistance to any ships that might have been unfortunate enough to have been cast on the beach. I have seen these revenue ships in the Arctic Ocean hanging close to the ice pack, so as to afford immediate relief in case any of the whalers should be nipped in the floe. It is because I have seen this heroic work done that I have carefully studied the work of the organization. For over fifteen years I have had personal conferences with the superintendent and engineer in chief of the service, and I know of the efforts that have been made by these executive heads to only take into the commissioned personnel young men of character, professional efficiency, and high integrity.

As for the engineers of the organization, their professional training and education have been of such nature that in a short time I would have no hesitation in intrusting to their charge the care and management of the machinery of our best war ships. I believe that the percentage of men and

officers who meet violent deaths in line of duty is greater in the Revenue-Cutter Service than it is in the Navy. The officers and men of this service have made sled journeys of hundreds of miles over the roughest kind of country in their attempt to carry relief to the shipwrecked whalers.

Both officers and men are proud of their organization. The cleanliness of the ships and the general discipline maintained show that all hands are imbued with the best traditions and customs of efficient military service.

The work of the Revenue Marine is a more dangerous occupation than that of the Navy, because the duty of the first organization is to police the coast, while the Navy really polices the ocean. It is seldom that a ship is now lost at sea. It is cruising along the coast that is dangerous, and this is the special province of the Revenue Marine.

Every reason that can be given for the creation of a retired list for the Army and Navy is applicable to that of the Revenue-Cutter Service. There is not a day when every man in all three organizations is not subject to call for perilous duty. The personnel of all three bodies is subject to military as well as to civil trial for various offenses. In entering all three services the civil rights of the individual are abridged and military responsibilities assumed.

The pay received by the officers of the Revenue Marine is not at all commensurate with the service rendered. The uniform of these officers differs but little from that of officers of the Navy. As the work of the service is in tropical as well as in arctic waters, the officers are obliged to keep on hand clothing of all descriptions. Since the only allowance given the personnel of the organization is a "ration" amounting to about 30 cents a day, it is necessary for all the married officers to practically keep up their individual homes, as well as to contribute a share of the mess expenses on board ship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I should like two minutes more. I have just one word further that I wish to say.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly; I will yield five minutes to the gentleman if he wishes it.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. The minority of this committee make no answer to the report of this Admiral. They make no disclaimer of what he says, of the facts he states; but they say that certain other services are just as much entitled to this consideration as this service.

Now, in conclusion, I want to call attention to this: The first cannon shot fired from any gun on any vessel in the war of the rebellion came from a revenue cutter; and is there any doubt of the gallantry and efficient service of Capt. D. B. Hodgson, who commanded the *McCullough*, the first boat that fired a gun in Manila Harbor? He, with the *McCullough*, was surveying in the port of Hongkong, engaged in an occupation of peace, but the cable of the President of the United States warned him to prepare immediately to engage in a naval battle which was to change the history of the world, and he steamed forward and was the first man at Manila to fire a shot in the engagement that sunk the Spanish fleet and sent down the Spanish flag. I believe that men of this character, who do this kind of work, should stand on an even plane and be entitled to the same protection, the same conditions, at equal salaries with the officers of the Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to engage in any general discussion of this measure at this time, but the argument of the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. HENRY C. SMITH] would be sufficient, so far as I am concerned, to cause me to oppose this bill.

The fact that the Army or the Navy, or both branches of the service, are overpaid, if they are, is to my mind no argument and no satisfactory reason why the pay and privileges of the Revenue-Cutter Service should be increased. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that I have never yet been able to find any good reason why any class of the military or other service of the Government of the United States should be entitled to pay after retirement. I do not believe that the man who voluntarily gives his services to the Army, to the Navy, or to the Revenue-Cutter Service, or to the purely civil branches of the Government, or to Congress, if you please, can give any good reason why he should receive pay in the nature of a pension after he has passed the age of his usefulness and after enjoying his salary while engaged in such service.

The truth is that the high order of pay and the high order of distinction given to some branches of the public service in this country has given life to a social and military class of aristocracy described by the gentleman who has just taken his seat, and we should rather seek to correct the evils on that line, which will only be increased by this bill. The truth of the business is, that to continue this whole system of legislation, to my mind, strongly tends toward the building up of an official class, an aristocracy in this country, as contradistinguished from the American citizen. [Applause.]

The eulogies paid by the gentleman to those connected with the Revenue-Cutter Service is an uncontradicted testimonial of its efficiency. I have heard no complaint that the service is decaying, or that the service is becoming less efficient now than it has been. The Service has been eulogized by every gentleman who has advocated this bill. If under the present laws, with the present pay and with the present privileges, they secure for this



branch of the service thoroughly efficient service, I know of no reason why it ought to be changed. This service, like the service in the Army and the Navy, is not a compulsory service. There is no service of the Government, civil or military, that is a compulsory service. If it was compulsory, and a man compelled or obliged to spend his life in that service, for which he is not paid sufficient to save something for a rainy day, then there might be some excuse for taking care of him in his old age.

In other words, if you have compelled the service you would be under obligations to protect him from want when he is too old and otherwise incapable of rendering that service. It is claimed on one side that the duties in the Revenue-Cutter Service are largely military, and on the other that they are purely civil. I do know that this service in time of peace lies along the lines of the civil duties of the country. We know that this service is where it ought to be, under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury. These men may be called upon to perform perilous duties at times. There is hardly a branch of the active executive duties involved in the Government that does not carry with it some chances and some dangers.

You might as well tell me that the deputy marshal or the marshal who takes his gun in his hand or his pocket and goes out to round in the wild-catters and gets killed, that their service being so perilous they ought to be pensioned after they go out of office. Ah, this is simply a growing evil. It is no answer to me that those in the Army enjoy retired pay; it is no answer to me that those in the Navy enjoy retirement and service pay. It is no argument that this service should receive it, because I do not believe it ought to be given to any service in this country. Our Federal judiciary receive retirement pay. That is no reason why that evil ought to be extended any further than it is. The truth is, if I had the opportunity, and if I had the power, I would take it away from all those who now enjoy it. [Loud applause.]

When a man undertakes to do duty for a fixed salary I would pay him that salary, and would pay him a salary that would be sufficient compensation for the service rendered. If it was not, then the salary ought to be directly increased; but I would not say to the men who were enjoying the fat places of the land and the high offices of the land, where exertion is in a large measure laid aside, that because they had the pie and stood at the pie counter until they are 64 years old that after that time they should be retired upon pay without rendering any service.

I would rather, sir, if I had to make my choice between the two propositions, turn my eyes to the real heroes of the country; I would rather go to the man who, in the fields, in the mines, and in other industrial pursuits, is striving day in and day out, through evil as well as good report, to earn enough to sustain himself and his family, and when he gets too old to render that service to himself, when he has no protection except such as he may have been able to lay up for a wet day, and bestow the gifts of the Government upon him. Therefore, to my mind, while this man is struggling for his living I would rather give it to him than the man who is enjoying the fat salary, and the fat place, and holding the offices, when there are thousands of men equally as competent who would be glad to enjoy such privileges.

Mr. Chairman, the very example cited in the two instances referred to a moment ago, in the civil branch of the Government, covering the judiciary and those in the military and naval service enjoying retired pay, is beginning to produce its evil results. We hear every day clamorings for a civil pension list; claiming that the man who surrenders so much to accept a salary greater than he ever enjoyed before, in some department of this Government, and wears himself out in drawing his salary, shall be placed on a pension roll and given retirement pay after he gets too old to work. It is not right, Mr. Chairman; it is not just. It is not just to the people or the Government. I care not what the service is, the man who voluntarily engages to render this country service for a stipulated salary ought to be required to look to it that he saves a competency for himself in his old age.

If that is not to be the rule, it is impracticable that the other rule should be universal. In other words, it is much more of an argument to my mind much more substantial justice would be accorded by helping men who did not enjoy these privileges during the strength and vigor of their manhood rather than adding to the profits they have enjoyed during that period after they become too old to render such service.

The proposition in this bill carries with it, to my mind, an additional evil, because, from the debate here, it is evident that the service of these men is largely within the civil sphere. They carry guns, their duty requires them to drill, they may be called into military service of the Government in time of war, and if they do God knows that the laws of the United States provides ample protection for the care of those who serve in the wars of the Republic.

If you are going to base it upon that, extend it to that great

class of people, the real heroes, that in every struggle of the Republic from its inception down to this time, who, when danger is abroad in the land, do not wait for orders, but rush to the rescue of their homes and their country. Do not build up these classes while those honest, patriotic men who love their country because they hope their country will allow them in the race of life to enjoy equal rights and common protection—do not put before them the picture of the injustice, and, in its ultimate consequences, the iniquitous proposition of giving men service pay or longevity pay after you have paid them ample salaries.

It will not be calculated to make the bone and sinew of the country love their Government more. Any law that leads in the direction that those in the military service or in any other service of the Government are for that reason entitled to more beneficence from this Government than the honest man who by his daily struggle earns his bread, but who has never been permitted to enjoy the privileges of a lucrative salary, is pernicious and wrong. If we continue upon the course already begun, if we take the one step by passing this bill and place these 300 officers in this category with first an increase, as the report states, averaging 40 per cent of their salaries, and not only that, we give to them the service pay, which is a certain per cent additional for the time they have served, and beyond that retiring them at the age of 64 or upon the certificate of an examining board approved by the President, carrying them to a permanent waiting list, with compensation at full pay for life, I ask you, gentlemen, where it will all end? As was well said by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON], who preceded me, it is to not only retire them, but to retire them on greatly increased pay.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Not only that, but you give them larger pay than the corresponding officers receive in the Navy.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the suggestion; that was one proposition that I had not discovered in the brief investigation I have given the bill. But it only shows the tendency of the times. By this bill you put these men and their salaries at more than those enjoy for like offices in the naval service. To-morrow some friend will come and present a bill, saying that it is an injustice to the American Navy that you are paying these men in a civil branch of the Government more salary than you are paying corresponding officers in that great military arm of the Government. No man will be heard to say let us reduce these salaries, for God knows that when once they take the step upward, when once a salary is fixed at a certain amount, you might just as well try to turn over the Rocky Mountains as to undertake to repeal a bill of that sort in the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill brings to the attention of Congress a subject of the utmost importance. Shall we establish a civil pension list? Undoubtedly the constabulary of the revenue department, a bureau of the Treasury Department, performs essentially civil duties. It will not be contended that United States marshals and their deputies, and other officials connected with the enforcement of the excise laws throughout the war country, are not civil officers. The Revenue-Cutter Service may be called a marine constabulary, performing on the seacoast substantially the duties performed on land by similar officials. It is said that they may be drafted into the naval service at any time during war.

That is true, but from 1865 until 1898 no emergency arose by which these Treasury officials were in fact drafted into the naval service, and there is nothing to indicate that in the next generation a single one of them will be drafted into the naval service. On the contrary, we may fairly indulge the expectation that no such duty will be required at their hands. If gentlemen here consider that temporary service in the Navy should entitle them to enjoy the rank of naval officers while so employed, with a place on the retired list later, it would have been better to bring forward a bill providing that when these revenue officers shall be called upon to perform the duty of naval officers they shall stand on terms of equality with naval officers of similar rank. Assuredly the possibility of their being required to perform such service can not justify this measure.

This brings to our attention another problem. Probably the most notable of all the abuses of the monarchy—probably the one which first and last has to a greater extent than any other called down on the heads of the monarchs the wrath of the people—has been the distinct recognition of the government class as such, the imputation being that all the people of the country must bear burdens to the end that those next to the source of power may enjoy unearned emoluments. The civil lists of kings have been



justly denounced as the meanest and most unjustifiable abuse of personal government and as inimical to the general welfare. Now comes a proposition that sounds in the same doctrine. It is undoubtedly true that recently in this country there is a tendency to the distinct recognition of the governing class as such. The motive power of legislation such as the measure under consideration is the opinion—entertained not only by those in the employment of the Government permanently, but by some of those temporarily called to the legislative halls to enact laws for the Government of the country—that when one enters the Government service the burden of providing for his future support may be justly imposed upon the Government—that is, by the taxpayers.

Now, under somewhat similar conditions to those existing in the thickly populated parts of our country a similar problem arises in all the countries of Europe at this time, but government employees are not the subjects of the benefices proposed over there to superannuated dependents. A generation ago the extent to which the individual throughout the German States and principalities was independent from his cradle to his grave was remarked by all writers on the subject. There were fewer almshouses, less necessity for public charity, in the German States than in any other part of Europe. Industrial conditions have changed. Germany has taken on the modern industrial system, by which a growing number depend from day to day and from the cradle to the grave upon their ability to earn subsistence by performing manual labor in a manner satisfactory to a taskmaster, obedient to the new conditions produced by the new industrial order. Germany now pensions aged laborers. Not only in Germany, but wherever the modern industrial system has been fully developed, those dependent solely on labor for a living find themselves, in old age, superannuated and unable to maintain themselves. The civil pension list is the result. But, mark you, it is the laborers and not classes who, in the period in which they are capable of earning comparatively lucrative salaries, who are eligible to this benefice.

The pending measure is based upon the theory that the Government owes a peculiar duty to those engaged in one particular branch of the Government service. Is this position tenable? If we should undertake to provide for deserving indigents, how would we proceed to ascertain who would have the fairest claim upon the taxpayers of the country, high-salaried employees of the Government or aged laborers who have never fed upon the public bounty? Do you say we should pay attention first to those who may be summoned to the defense of the flag? That would include every healthy male citizen in the country; for in an emergency justifying it all would be subject to that requisition. But the friends of the bill say those employed in the Revenue-Cutter Service are more liable to be called into the service than the rest. I think I have shown that such a thing is only a remote probability, and that this contingency could be dealt with more suitably by legislation dealing directly with it. Besides, of their own volition, the employees enter the Revenue Service at salaries, I will say, at least as large as they could command in private employment, and may quit the service at their pleasure.

What good reason can be advanced in support of the proposal to establish a civil pension list? Is not the salary of the average Government employee larger than that paid for similar services in private employment? Are not Government employees more secure in the term of their employment, less subject to the vicissitudes that attend men in private life, and in every way in a better position to lay by something against the approach of old age than those who perform similar work in private employment? In case of a few weeks' sickness do the salaries of high public officials cease? If for the purpose of preserving his health a well-paid public official concludes to make a brief journey or enjoy a season of recreation, does his pay cease? No; the public servants for whom there is so much solicitude are accorded privileges and enjoy immunities unknown to those engaged similarly in private life.

Is it not true, then, that they, more easily than any other class of our citizens, can lay by a competence for old age? Is it not true, also, that first and last they enjoy opportunities of every kind and description—social and otherwise—unknown to those in private life? Now, if they do enjoy all these things, where can we find excuse or apology for placing them on the retired list, and during their natural lives pay them large salaries?

In the course of the debate mentioned one gentleman censured the social discrimination practiced by Army and Naval officials in their dealings with the employees of the revenue service. Why, sir, in this respect the revenue officials are not alone. We must expect that those who wear epaulets will assert social exclusiveness and constitute an aristocratic group more or less amusing and certainly harmless. I may remark, in passing, however, that the wearers of epaulets enjoy no monopoly in snobdom. There are others. How often do we read in the newspapers that in offi-

cial swelldom a controversy is raging as to whether at an approaching function at the White House or at one of the foreign embassies this or that lady shall have precedence in the receiving line? What a grave problem it is, to be sure, this question as to just what order shall prevail in assigning persons to posts of distinction in social functions! Whether the wife of this dignitary or the wife of that dignitary shall stand at the head of the line at a pink tea! I do not see how these questions, highly important though they may be to the parties to such controversies, can cut a figure in this discussion, except it be to emphasize the silly pretensions of those who imagine that here, as at the courts of kings, individually and collectively, those in public life are disposed to take on the airs of a governing class. Snobbery is one way of indicating this feeling. Demands for peculiar immunities and emoluments is another.

Meantime the American people will continue in their everyday life to assign positions of distinction in social life to those who, on democratic grounds, seem to deserve them, and will continue to be sometimes amused and sometimes angered by the antics of official snobdom.

If the amusing pretensions to which attention has been called are of any value in determining the merits of the pending measure they furnish an argument against it. Probably one thing that makes some of our public officials less democratic than those who placed epaulets on their shoulders is the fact that our laws mark them as of the elect, and they take the lawmaker at his word. They are only living up to the full measure of the opportunities we give them. Each member of Congress has the right to appoint students at the Naval and Military Academies.

In my district this honor is disposed of by a competitive examination, and the boy who wins the prize enjoys it. He may be the son of a blacksmith or the son of a washerwoman. He may be a bootblack off the street. Whoever he may be, whatever circle he may be drawn from, if he be built on the snob pattern, which unfortunately is not unfashionable, forty years hence he will strut the streets of this capital enjoying half or three-quarters pay, living up on quality hill. He will have forgotten his origin as utterly as if he had not in his boyhood days known humbler walks of life. Fortunately this is not universal, or even the rule, but cases like that I have sketched are not infrequent.

I do not object to three-quarters pay for military and naval officers. Whether I would sanction it as an original proposition or not is immaterial. It is an established system and will never be disturbed. It rests upon reasons in no way applicable to the civil service. I know some gentlemen who are engaged in the Revenue-Cutter Service. Doubtless they prefer it to private employment or they would not be there. Probably some of them have made life a burden to Congressmen and Senators, who, of course, were glad to secure first employment and then promotion. Now comes this bill for their promotion to the grade of naval officers. They probably had good employment at home. Why did they seek employment here? Was it understood when they obtained employment in the Revenue Service that they were to be secure in their positions throughout the period of their usefulness, and receive thereafter, until death, pay for services which they will not perform?

Was it understood that when they accepted places at good salaries that they might spend their salaries, regardless, paying no attention to provision for the future, leaving all that to a beneficent Government? Are we to say to a young man who becomes identified with this branch of the Government service that thereby he becomes identified with the governing class and is henceforth a ward of the taxpayers, who until his death must support him? I do not think so. Go to the various departments and you will see gray-headed men and women who have been in service a long while. These old people can not possibly maintain themselves much longer. Can we afford to put them on the retired list? If we are to enter upon this kind of an inquiry, why not pursue it further. If old age and indigence are to be grounds for paying largesses out of the Treasury, why not take into account the aged in private life, whose circumstances are no better, and probably a great deal worse, than those in the Government service?

In the sunless and starless caverns of the earth, in the mines, at the mouths of the blazing forge, in employments both dangerous and unwholesome you will find in private employment men grizzled with age, who, in their walk and way, have faithfully served their country. They have been good citizens, have supported their families, educated their children, paid their taxes, and contributed their full share to the general weal. Shall you say to those, why, you did not get Government employment. Then you might have been provided for in old age. If you had obtained a place in the Government service, old age would have been provided for.

Mr. Chairman, I fear the time will come when modern industrial conditions will compel all governments to take notice of the



necessities of the superannuated laborer. Given the full development of the system which is so rapidly consigning so large a portion of the people to the estate of wage-earners, tell me what is to become of the man who, without skill, or very little skill, performs the rough, hard, arduous labor of the world.

Singular it may be, but it is true, that the common laborer is in an essential respect the mainstay of society. He populates the world. In town or country this holds true. In the laborer's hut and the humble habitation of the tenant farmer the large families are found. Thus is consumed from day to day his meager earnings. What is to become of the common laborer a little later on, when modern industrialism has found complete development?

Some economists have prescribed as a remedy for the difficulties and troubles of the laborer the limitation of the family circle. They would solve the problem by limiting the procreation of the species. Only one great civilized nation practices this formula, and its population, undepleted by extensive emigration, remains at a standstill, and everywhere the phenomenon witnessed nowhere else except in France is regarded as a national calamity.

In conclusion, I desire to say that I believe that Government employees, are better paid than any other class of employees in the country and have a better opportunity to provide for old age than any others; therefore they should not be singled out for special governmental benefices. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time has been consumed on our side?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour and thirty minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized for thirty minutes.

In anything that I have to say upon this bill I wish to distinctly disavow any intention to raise a question even concerning the courage, the ability, or the motives of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service or of those officers of the Government who have to deal with that department. I have no doubt that in both war and peace this service is officered by men courageous and able.

It is the spirit of the American genius which permeates the Revenue-Cutter Service, as it permeates all classes of our people when they enter either the regular or the volunteer service in time of war or when they are engaged in time of peace. But the question which is presented to Congress is one which seems to me of so much importance that we do not need to regard the present personnel of the service in order to determine whether they are right in asking additional privileges. I make no complaint in reference to their conduct. In the little examination which I have endeavored to make of this matter I have received extreme courtesy at the hands of Captain Shoemaker, the chief of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and of the men in his office, for which I have to and do now return to him my sincere acknowledgments.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], when the matter was up as to whether the rule should be passed for the consideration of this bill, stated, referring to me:

He has charged that officer of this Government, whose duty it is to make reports of facts, to state truths, that year after year he has lied in the discharge of his official duty. Is it not time there should be some inquiry with regard to a matter of that kind, and that the gentleman should be given an opportunity to make proof of reckless and irresponsible charges of this character? I think that the House must have been satisfied when the gentleman took his seat that at least he should have an opportunity in a proper and a legitimate way to make good some small modicum at least of these grave charges.

Mr. Chairman, more language of the same sort was indulged in by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, for whose ability no one has a greater respect than I have. But, Mr. Chairman, it was not I who charged that the officer of the Government lied. I made no charge in reference to any officer of the Government. I only endeavor to state facts. What the result of those facts may be is for the House to determine.

It is a matter of complete personal indifference to me whether this bill becomes a law or not, except that I construe it to be my duty as a member of the committee reporting the bill to lay before the House such information, which may bear upon the question, as has come to me.

I stated on Thursday last as a reason why this matter should not be considered at all at the present time that the Revenue-Cutter Service, through the Secretary of the Treasury, or, if it pleases the gentleman better, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Revenue-Cutter Service, together or singly, had not complied with the law, which requires them to make a detailed statement of their expenditures. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] endeavored to answer that proposition by saying that they did make a detailed statement of the expenditures. I called the attention of the House to the act itself upon this subject, included in the sundry civil act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889:

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress at its next session a detailed statement of the expenditures for the fiscal year 1888 under

the appropriation for the Revenue-Cutter Service, and annually thereafter a detailed statement of expenditures under said appropriation shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session thereof.

That statute remains in force, unrepealed, and yet the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], denying that there had been a failure of compliance, called the attention of the House to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting estimates of appropriations, and in this letter, transmitting the estimates of appropriations, there is no pretense of giving a statement of expenditures. The only items in the estimate on page 289, which the gentleman from New York cited, are items under a column which is headed, "Estimated amount required for each detailed object of expenditure," which means for the ensuing fiscal year. I leave it to the House to judge whether I accused the Department of anything, or whether I stated anything which was not absolutely true.

In this column and under this heading there are 11 items, aggregating the sum of \$1,482,545. Even if these items related to the expenditures of the past year at all, which they do not, they could hardly be called a detailed statement of expenditures. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] might have called attention to the fact that these 11 items of estimates were based on Appendix S in the Book of Estimates.

The deficiency bill approved March 2, 1889 (25 Stat., 907) provided that the annual estimates for the Revenue-Cutter Service should be given—

in detail, showing separately the amount required for pay of officers, rations for officers, pay of crews, rations of crews, fuel, repairs and outfits, ship chandlery, and for traveling and contingent expenses. He shall also include in the annual Book of Estimates a statement showing the authorized number of officers and cadets in the Revenue-Cutter Service, their rank and pay; also the number of men constituting the crews of vessels in said service.

Notwithstanding the positive requirements of the act of October 2, 1888, the Revenue-Cutter Service does not even pretend to furnish a detailed statement of the expenditures for any fiscal year. The appropriation for the Revenue-Cutter Service has always been made in a lump sum. The Revenue-Cutter Service makes a sort of compliance with the provisions of the act of March 2, 1889, requiring a detailed estimate of the money required for that service for the ensuing fiscal year, but in every estimate so submitted the Revenue-Cutter Service has insisted that it could get along with less money if the appropriation were made in bulk than if made in specific items, and through this means it has continued to secure a bulk appropriation each year for which it makes no report to Congress, notwithstanding the statute positively requires a detailed report of the expenditures.

Not only this, the act of March 2, 1889, requires that the Secretary of the Treasury shall include in the annual Book of Estimates a statement showing the authorized number of officers and cadets in the Revenue-Cutter Service, their rank and pay, also the number of men constituting the crews of vessels in said service.

The effort to comply with this statutory provision is found in Appendix S of the last Book of Estimates. The statute says that the statement shall show the authorized number of officers and cadets in the Revenue-Cutter Service. It is admitted and known that there are cadets in the service, but in Appendix S there is no reference either to the name, rank, or class of cadets, nor any statement concerning them or referring to them whatever. Nor is there any statement referring to cadets anywhere in the Book of Estimates. Evidently the Revenue-Cutter Service does not wish to call attention to the fact that there are cadets or its favoritism shown in their selection. It is the policy of the Revenue-Cutter Service to keep everything, so far as possible, under cover and in the dark.

According to the official register of the service dated July 1, 1900, there were 18 cadets. Each of these cadets draws a salary from the Government, but the Book of Estimates does not show any cadets or ask for any appropriation for their pay.

The requirement in the statute that the statement shall contain the number of men constituting the crews of vessels in said service was evidently intended to require the number of the crew of each vessel, so that Congress might know the number of men employed on each of the revenue cutters. This intention of the law is skillfully evaded. The statement furnished in the Book of Estimates does not pretend to give any information concerning the number of men constituting the crew of any particular vessel and does not furnish information of any special value in consideration of the Revenue-Cutter Service.

The statement furnished is, for example, in the following form:

	Per month.
1 seaman, at.....	\$56
25 seamen, at.....	45
7 seamen, at.....	40
14 seamen, at.....	37
40 seamen, at.....	35
3 seamen, at.....	32
39 seamen, at.....	30
40 seamen, at.....	28

The theory of the requirement of the statute is wholly ignored.



The items relating to the Revenue-Cutter Service in the Book of Estimates, including Appendix S, are not by any means a proper compliance with the act of 1889, and they are not even a pretended compliance with the act of 1888.

I hold in my hands a copy of the sundry civil bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, which is the act of October 2, 1888. This contains the requirement about a detailed statement of expenditures annually from the Revenue-Cutter Service, which I have quoted before, and it also contains, in precisely the same form, a similar requirement of detailed statement of expenditures from the Smithsonian Institution.

I hold in my hands now House Document 31 of this session of Congress, being a detailed statement of expenditures of the Smithsonian Institution for the last fiscal year. The amount appropriated annually for the Smithsonian Institution is only a small portion of the amount appropriated for the Revenue-Cutter Service, and yet this detailed statement of expenditures by the Smithsonian Institution covers 47 pages of finely printed matter, giving in detail the expenditures for the year. This is a proper compliance with the statute. The Revenue-Cutter Service does not comply with the statute, makes no report of its expenditures, but demands a civil pension list and other privileges.

#### LIVES ACTUALLY RESCUED FROM DROWNING.

In the debate the other day on the question whether a special rule to consider this bill should be granted or not I called attention to the difficulty of obtaining information concerning what the Revenue-Cutter Service has done or is doing, and stated that there was a disagreement between the report of the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the number of lives saved and the report of the officers of the revenue cutters themselves. I did this at the time, not for the purpose of finding fault with the Revenue-Cutter Service, but for the purpose of showing the necessity of waiting for action until we could have published proper reports of this Service, so that we might know the facts and learn whether the facts justified granting any special privileges to the officers of this service.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] has endeavored this morning to answer and refute my statement in regard to the 103 lives which were credited to the revenue cutter *Gresham* August 13, 1900. I called his attention at the time to the fact that I had received and held then in my hands a copy of the detailed report of the captain of the *Gresham* in reference to that occurrence, and in this detailed report occurs the following:

Number, names, and residences of persons actually rescued from drowning? None.

I stated the other day that if this report had been published it would so show, that no lives were "actually rescued from drowning." I think even the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] will admit that I was right.

I did not make the statement at the time for the purpose of attacking the Revenue-Cutter Service, but simply for the purpose of urging upon the House that there was not sufficient information before it upon which to intelligently act upon this bill.

But now that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] has undertaken to show that 103 lives were "actually rescued from drowning" by the *Gresham* from the barkentine *Fraternidade* on August 13, 1900, I wish to briefly present to the House the information which I acquired in regard to this and the method pursued by me.

The Revenue-Cutter Service is, I believe, the only branch of the Government which makes no annual report, so that I could not acquire information in regard to the operations of the service from any report made by it. The only report in regard to the Revenue-Cutter Service for the last year is found in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, on page 54, and, so far as it relates to the actual operations of the Revenue-Cutter Service, occupies about one-fourth of a page. This portion of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury was, of course, prepared by the chief of the Revenue-Cutter Service. In this report the Secretary includes several items, the second one of which is the following:

Lives saved (actually rescued) from drowning, 178.

Now, what was the purpose of putting this item in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury? It was plainly for the purpose of showing what important duties the Revenue-Cutter Service is performing and the great service it performs to the people on the sea and to our country in the matter of saving lives.

I did not have time or opportunity to investigate all of the claims put forward by the Revenue-Cutter Service, but I concluded I would ascertain as to the truth of this item, and if the Revenue-Cutter Service had actually rescued 178 lives from drowning for the last fiscal year, I would give them credit for efficient work in that respect, and if they had not performed this good work I should feel extremely sorry that anyone had reported the item as published.

This is what I found. In the office in the Treasury building of

the Revenue-Cutter Service is a volume which contains, on page 64, "Consolidation of record of vessels of the Revenue-Cutter Service for the year of 1900 and 1901." One of the columns in this consolidated record is headed "Number of lives saved," and this is the only reference to life saving in the consolidated record. The total under this heading is 178, and in the number to make up this total the revenue cutter *Gresham* is credited with 104. An examination of the monthly consolidated record of the *Gresham* shows that that vessel is credited with 103 lives saved in the month of August, 1900, as entered up in this same volume in the Revenue-Cutter Service Office. For that month of August the *Gresham* is credited with having assisted two vessels in distress, the two vessels having a total value for vessels and cargo of \$83,000, with 111 persons on board, and 103 lives saved.

The two cases in which the *Gresham* rendered assistance to other vessels in August, 1900, were the cases of the *Fraternidade*, August 13, 1900, and the *White Wings*, August 19, 1900. The *White Wings* had only 8 persons on board, and none of these was taken off that vessel.

According to the consolidated report, therefore, the *Gresham* saved 103 lives from the *Fraternidade* on August 13, 1900. By the time this report had gone through the monthly and yearly consolidation and through the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury and appeared in print in his annual report it is stated that these 103 persons were actually rescued from drowning, and this notwithstanding the report made by the captain of the revenue cutter *Gresham*, August 15, 1900, regarding the assistance furnished to the *Fraternidade* that the "number of persons actually rescued from drowning" was "none."

I will ask leave to have printed in the RECORD papers which have been sent to me by the Revenue-Cutter Office in regard to this occurrence. These include a letter from Captain Walker, of the *Gresham*, as well as his detailed report. The letter from Captain Walker, as furnished to me, is not complete. It is sufficient, however, to show that no lives were "actually rescued from drowning" and that the revenue cutter and its officers incurred no danger or hardship whatever in the matter. If a complete copy of the letter had been furnished to me it would have shown this fact in still stronger light. But the detailed report of Captain Walker absolutely establishes the fact that he did not pretend that he rescued one person from drowning, much less 103.

I do not deny, Mr. Chairman, that this revenue cutter at that time performed efficient service. It would be strange if, with 40 vessels in the Revenue-Cutter Service, they should never come to an occasion where they might perform service to a vessel in distress. They performed such service in this case. It is the one case during the last year where they performed greater service than any other which I have been able to discover; but I deny that they rescued any lives from drowning, if the report of the captain of the cutter itself is correct. I do not know what they did. I only know what the report says, and I say that the report of the captain says they rescued no lives from drowning, while the tabulated report when made up says that they at that time rescued 103 lives from drowning.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to conceal in this matter. All the information which I have obtained I lay before the House.

I found that the revenue steamer *Galveston*, located at Galveston, Tex., was credited with saving 40 lives from drowning at the time of the hurricane at that city in September, 1900, and I asked the Chief of the Revenue-Cutter Service to furnish me a copy of the report. I shall ask leave to print this in the RECORD for what it is worth.

What we want and what we ought to have some time before acting upon a bill like this is a report from the service showing what they do. I listened to the distinguished gentleman from New York, who occupied an hour, and who stated at the beginning that he would tell what duties the service performed; but I failed to hear him tell a single duty which they do perform. I will be very glad to hear upon this floor what the Revenue Service of the country does. I know what the law says it shall do. It says, among other things, they shall "protect the timber reserves;" but I apprehend it is seldom they get their boats on a forest reserve. What they do is one of the mysteries which I have been unable to fathom. We ought to have an annual report.

Now, the law which requires them to submit a detailed estimate of expenditures is not the only law they observe in the breach. There is also a law requiring each department of the Government to furnish a list of all its employees, to be published in the Official Register, known as the Blue Book. So far as my observation has gone, every other branch of the Government service publishes a complete list of its employees. Those branches of the Government which have vessels publish a complete list of the men upon them. The only branch which declines or which has neglected to comply with this provision of the law is the Revenue-Cutter Service; and it seems to me that we are entitled to information upon that point before we act upon a bill like this.



There are other provisions of the law which they do not observe, and which they have not pretended to observe. There are some which they have pretended to observe, but have not succeeded in observing according to the provisions of the statute.

But, Mr. Chairman, these observations have all been addressed to the consideration of the merits of the bill at this time. That matter has been passed upon by the House.

The bill has been ordered taken up, and we have to come to the conclusion as to whether the bill, in the light of the information which we now have, ought to be passed. What is the bill, and what is its purpose? Broadly stated, this bill proposes, first, to increase the pay of Revenue-Cutter officers by giving them 10 per cent increase for each five years' service up to the 40 per cent increase. This is based upon the provisions of the Army and Navy pay. It is not my purpose to enter upon any discussion concerning the Army or the Navy. Some of the gentlemen who have addressed the House in favor of this bill, notably the gentleman from Michigan, seemed to think it necessary to attack the Navy. I do not propose to enter upon a defense of the Navy. It requires no defense from attacks of that kind. I do not know—and I am frank to admit it—that I should favor, if it were a new proposition, if I had a chance to oppose it, the proposition to put men upon the retired list as now done. I think it is generally admitted that the retired list, both in the Army and Navy, has become a grievous burden in many respects.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. When a new proposition of this kind was made four years ago to put the Navy officers on the retired list with an increased rank, with the pay and emoluments of the grade above them, did you not vote for that proposition?

Mr. MANN. Well, my recollection is, Mr. Chairman, that there was no roll call upon that matter. I was not very favorable to the proposition, I may say to the gentleman; and I may say to him further that in my opinion the Navy personnel bill would never have passed the House if the House had understood its provisions in regard to increasing the rank and pay on the retired list.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think I find the name of MANN—M-A-N-N—among the list of yeas voting on the passage of that bill. I do not know that there was any other gentleman of that name in the House except my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If there was a roll call upon the bill, Mr. Chairman, I undoubtedly voted for it. I was much younger in experience then even than I am now in reference to such matters. If I had been in the House as long as my distinguished friend from Iowa has been, I should not have voted for that bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, in order that the gentleman may ease his conscience by declarations of that character, and with reference to his statement a moment ago that there was no publication of the persons employed in the Revenue-Cutter Service in the Blue Book, I wish to call his attention to page 252 of the first volume of the Official Register of the United States, commonly called the "Blue Book."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. MANN. I am very glad to yield, because I see the gentleman is making a mistake, which I will be very glad to correct.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think he will find the names of all the officers and of all the vessels set forth on pages 252, 253, 254, 255, and 256.

Mr. MANN. And I will call the attention of the distinguished gentleman to the law with reference to the Official Register. It says that there shall be included within this—

a full and complete list of all officers, agents, clerks, and other employees of said department, bureau, office, commission, or institution connected with the legislative, executive, or judicial service of the Government or paid from the United States Treasury, including military and naval officers of the United States, cadets, and midshipmen.

And if the gentleman can find the name of any clerk, employee, or any other person upon a Revenue-Cutter vessel other than a commissioned officer, I will abandon my speech and quit the opposition to this bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. All of the clerks, I am informed, are under the proper heading. Not necessarily in this place. Does the gentleman mean to say that the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy or the Revenue-Cutter Service should be found in the Blue Book?

Mr. MANN. Not the enlisted men of the Army and Navy, except warrant officers—certainly not, under the law—but the enlisted men of the Revenue-Cutter Service are required to be published in the Blue Book. The enlisted men of the transport service are published in the Blue Book, and the men on all of the other vessels of the Government, outside of the Regular Army and Navy, are published in the Blue Book, except the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. There is no requirement that the thousand and odd enlisted men should have a place in the Blue Book.

Mr. MANN. If they are not employees paid out of the Treasury of the United States, then it is true; but under the law if they are employees of the Government or are paid out of the Treasury of the United States, they are required to be published in the Blue Book. Mr. Chairman, there is no escape from that proposition. I do not know whether the attempt was deliberate, or whether it was negligent, or whether it was lack of knowledge of the law. I make no charge against the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service. I have no doubt they are as competent and capable as officers usually are. But I say when we are considering a proposition for the creation of a civil pension law which will eventually lead to pensioning every clerk in every department of the civil portion of the Government, we ought to have information in every respect, where required by the law, upon the subject.

But, Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to do more than is done either for the Army or the Navy as to the retired list. They say they want to put the Revenue-Cutter Service upon a par with the Navy, but the bill does more than that. In the Army there are two retirement lists; one is a limited retired list and the other is an unlimited retired list. On the unlimited list are officers' names who are over 64 years of age. But when an officer is retired under the age of 64 for disability the number is limited. But there is no limitation in this Revenue-Cutter bill as to retiring officers for disability. If this bill becomes a law, the Revenue-Cutter board which retires officers can make places for men below them; they can retire them ad libitum, with no control upon their number.

In the Navy there is no retirement for age except above the rank of lieutenant-commander. The attempt here is to put a caption in the Revenue-Cutter Service on a par with a lieutenant-commander in the Navy. There is no retirement for age in the Navy for a lieutenant-commander. Here is a proposition to give the Revenue-Cutter Service as to the retired list a better position than is occupied by the Army or Navy.

I wish I had time, Mr. Chairman, to call particularly the attention of the House to the increase in pay which will be caused by this bill. I call the attention of the House to one proposition which has been referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] in opposition to the bill. Now, let us understand this bill.

A lieutenant-commander in the Navy, after twenty years of service, receives \$3,500 a year, and of course, as a rule, or almost invariably, they serve twenty years before they reach the point or rank of a lieutenant-commander. So under this bill a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service would receive a salary of \$3,500 a year and a lieutenant-commander in the Navy would receive \$3,500 per year. In addition to the salary which is received under the bill a certain allowance is given them for commutation of quarters when not provided with quarters. That allowance is \$48 per month. The Revenue-Cutter officer also receives a Navy ration per day. Here is a proposition to give the Revenue-Cutter officers at sea or on shore—and a pretty large per cent of them are always on shore—\$3,500 for a captain, \$48 a month in addition for commutation of quarters, and a Navy ration. Now, what will a Navy officer of a corresponding grade get? If he is on shore he receives \$3,500 a year, less 15 per cent, or \$2,975 a year. The Navy officer on shore will receive \$2,975 a year as a lieutenant-commander, while the Revenue captain under this bill will receive \$3,500 a year, besides the various allowances.

The great claim which is so strongly urged is that the Revenue-Cutter Service ought to be put upon at least terms of equality with the Navy. I wish to call attention to an actual case by way of illustration for the purpose of showing that under the pending bill Revenue-Cutter officers will be paid better than in the Navy.

According to the Navy Register issued January 1, 1903, Lieut. Commander James Hamilton Sears is on duty at the branch hydrographic office, New York City. The Register shows that he entered the naval service September 22, 1871, and was appointed lieutenant-commander March 29, 1899. Having been in the service for more than twenty years, his pay, with longevity increase, amounts to \$3,500 per year, less 15 per cent because he is on land duty, or \$2,975 per annum, and in addition thereto \$576 for commutation of quarters, making a total of \$3,551.

Now, let us make a comparison of a Revenue-Cutter officer under the same circumstances, according to the provisions of the pending bill.

According to the last Revenue-Cutter Service register, July 1, 1901, Capt. Samuel E. Maguire is on duty at New York City as superintendent of construction in the Life-Saving Service. He entered the Revenue-Cutter Service March 8, 1871, and was appointed a captain May 8, 1896. Having been in the service for



more than twenty years, he would, under the bill, be entitled to a salary of \$3,500 a year, and in addition thereto commutation for quarters allowed a major in the Army, amounting to \$48 a month, or \$576 a year, making a total of \$4,076, or \$525 more than Lieutenant-Commander Sears receives. And this although the bill purports to only put captains in the Revenue-Cutter Service on an equal footing with lieutenant-commanders in the Navy.

In the above illustration I have not computed Captain Maguire as being entitled to one Navy ration per day or commutation therefor, although the present statute gives him that allowance and the pending bill does not expressly repeal it.

Mr. Chairman, there is considerably more which I wish to say to the House upon this subject later, but I do not desire to further occupy the time of the House at present. I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD in order that I may insert various tables, letters, memoranda, statements, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to occupy the floor any longer at present. I reserve the balance of my time.

The tables, letters, etc., are as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
DIVISION OF REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE,  
Washington, March 18, 1902.

HON. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: Agreeably to the request contained in your letter of the 17th instant, I inclose \* \* \* a copy of the formal report of assistance rendered by the *Gresham* to the barkentine *Fraternidade* August 13, 1901. It is presumed that this will not afford any additional information to what has already been furnished you, as the report of Captain Walker is more complete than that contained in the copy of the report inclosed. The two taken together include all the information concerning that matter which is on file in the Department. \* \* \*

Respectfully,  
C. F. SHOEMAKER,  
Captain, Revenue-Cutter Service, Chief of Division.

Report of assistance rendered by the U. S. S. *Gresham*, Capt. Thomas D. Walker, R. C. S., commanding, stationed at New York, N. Y., and cruising from Delaware Breakwater, Del., to Martha's Vineyard, Mass. Date of service rendered, August 13, 1901.

1. Name of vessel, *Fraternidade*.
2. Rig and tonnage, barkentine; 250 tons.
3. Nationality and home port, Portuguese; Brava, Cape Verde Islands.
4. Where from, Brava.
5. Where bound, New Bedford, Mass.
6. Number of days out, thirty-seven.
7. Number of crew (including master), 21.
8. Number of passengers, 82.
9. Nature of cargo, goat skins and ballast.
10. Estimated value of vessel, \$10,000.
11. Estimated value of cargo, unknown.
12. Name and address of master, Braz T. Pino, No. 2 Griffin street, New Bedford, Mass.
13. Names and addresses of owners, Joab B. Farie, Brava, Cape Verde.
14. Names and addresses of consignees, captain.
15. Condition of vessel when found, anchored close to lee shore; very heavy sea; one anchor gone; expecting the other one to part any time.
16. Time of day or night when found, 5.15 p. m.
17. State of weather, overcast; cloudy; very threatening.
18. Direction and force of wind, 7; SE, by E.
19. State of tide and sea, heavy sea running; flood tide.
20. Exact spot where vessel was found (locally designated, including country or State): Black Point, Rhode Island; 150 yards off rocks.
21. Latitude and longitude of same, 41° 24' N., 71° 27' W.
22. Cause and date of casualty, tried to tack; got in irons.
23. Duration of service rendered, two and three-fourths hours.
24. State nature of boat service, if any, running lines and communications.
25. If anything occurred to interfere with favorable operations, state nature and cause, heavy seas and wind.
26. Was vessel saved or lost? Saved.
27. If saved, estimated amount of damage sustained, lost port anchor and 30 fathoms chain.
28. Estimated value of cargo lost, none.
29. Number of persons cared for on cutter or afforded necessary transportation, none.
30. Number, names, and residences of persons actually rescued from drowning, none.
31. Number, names, and residences of persons lost, none.
32. Quantity of provisions or supplies furnished, and cost of same, none.
33. Quantity of fuel, etc., expended, and cost of same, immaterial.
34. Damages sustained by cutter, and estimated cost of repairs, none.
35. State any accident or injury to officers or crew of cutter, none.

#### REMARKS.

[A general statement of the casualty and the nature and extent of the services rendered will be here given.]

The *Fraternidade* was bound from Brava, Cape Verde Islands, for New Bedford with 103 persons on board. She had a favorable passage until off Montauk Point, where unfavorable winds kept them beating for seven days. The weather becoming very threatening, the captain deemed it best to try and make harbor, as he was short of provisions, water, and fuel, and the vessel was leaking. When off Black Point he tried to go about, missed stays, and got in irons, and as he was only about 1,000 yards from the rocks he let go his port anchor and 60 fathoms of chain, which parted before five minutes had elapsed. The starboard anchor was then let go and chain paid out to bitter end. This anchor dragged also, but she finally fetched up and the single anchor held her about 100 yards clear of the rocks. The heavy sea made the vessel strain and jump in such a manner that it was feared that the cable could not hold any time. Signal for assistance was set in the rigging and preparations made by the crew to save themselves when driven ashore. The sea getting larger and running heavier, the wind increasing in force, it was not deemed possible that they could survive. The *Gresham* was

coming from Newport, bound for New London, and seeing her signals of distress went to her assistance. We anchored 100 yards ahead of the vessel in 1½ fathoms of water. The cutter was lowered and, in charge of an officer, ran a small line to the vessel. Owing to the heavy sea, she was unable to go alongside, but managed to get the line to the bark. They bent on a steel wire hawser, which proved to be too short, so our 9-inch hawser was used instead. They then began to heave up their anchor.

Owing to the heavy seas and short distance off the rocks, when they had hove into 30 fathoms it was deemed best to drag the barkentine into deeper water and farther away, so that in case anything parted we could pick her up again before she was driven ashore. When an offing had been reached, the vessel was stopped, the anchor was hove up, and she was towed safely into Newport Harbor.

The foregoing is a true statement.

J. HUTCHISON SCOTT,  
Second Lieutenant.  
AUGUST 15, 1900.

Certified to be correct, and respectfully submitted.

THOMAS D. WALKER,  
Captain, Commanding.

Vessel assisting, *Gresham*.  
Vessel assisted, barkentine *Fraternidade*, 250 tons.  
Date, August 13, 1901.  
Number of persons on board, 103.  
Value of vessel, \$10,000.  
Nature of casualty, tried to tack, missed stays, and got in irons.  
Location, Black Point, Rhode Island.  
Detailed report:

Letter of Capt. T. D. Walker, R. C. S., commanding the *Gresham*, to the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury.

I have the honor to transmit herewith, for information of the Department, a report on Form 2013, of assistance rendered by the *Gresham* to the Portuguese barkentine *Fraternidade*, of Brava, Cape Verde Islands, on the 13th instant, near Narragansett Pier, R. I. We were cruising from Newport to New London, when we sighted the bark anchored dangerously near to the rocks with a distress signal flying, and we at once proceeded to extricate her. As we approached a second flag (ensign) was placed in the mizzen rigging, as though to emphasize the appeal of the unfortunate people for aid.

Owing to the sea the bark was riding heavily, and the captain momentarily expected that his only remaining cable would break. In that event the bark would have been dashed onto the rocks, and there is no telling what the consequences might have been. It is reasonably certain that serious loss of life would have resulted, as the people, especially the women, seemed badly demoralized. The safety of the bark and the large number of people on board hung as it were upon a very slender thread, and I feel thankful that our good little ship happened along at the right time and was able to do the right thing. No other vessel capable of sending assistance was in sight, and this made our presence the more opportune. Crowds of summer cottagers from Narragansett Pier lined the rocks, but, under the circumstances, they were powerless to render aid. The officers and crew of the ship did their duty well.

Respectfully, yours,

THOMAS D. WALKER,  
Captain, Revenue-Cutter Service, Commanding.

#### ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 1025, ENTITLED "A BILL TO PROMOTE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE."

The first section of the bill removes the present restriction of law upon the number of Revenue-Cutter officers and leaves the number of officers to be appointed wholly in the discretion of the President and permits him to increase them ad libitum. Section 1 also confers upon the engineer officers the rank of captain, first, second, and third lieutenant, respectively, being an entirely new provision in the service.

Section 2 confers upon Revenue-Cutter officers equal rank with certain Army and Navy officers and changes the present provision of law which directs that when Revenue-Cutter officers are serving under the Navy they shall rank next after lieutenants commanding in the Navy and provides that whenever forces of the Navy and Revenue-Cutter Service shall be serving in cooperation captains of the Revenue-Cutter Service shall rank with and next after lieutenant-commanders, thus making them rank over lieutenants commanding.

Section 3 provides that Revenue-Cutter Service officers shall receive the same pay and allowances, except forage, as are now or may hereafter be provided by law for officers of corresponding rank in the Army, including longevity pay. Under this section the pay of Revenue-Cutter Service officers is graded according to their arbitrary rank, as fixed by section 2, corresponding with rank in the Army, but not according to corresponding rank in the Navy.

Why does not the bill recite the pay?

Why should it refer to the pay of officers in the Army instead of officers in the Navy?

There are only a few classes of officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service and the only object of putting in a section of this sort is to avoid calling attention to the amount of pay and allowances to be actually obtained through it. What are the allowances? How much do they amount to?

Does this section repeal provision of the statute granting to Revenue-Cutter Service officers navy ration?

Or does it propose to give Revenue-Cutter Service officers both Navy ration and commutation for quarters?

Or Navy ration in addition to pay when on sea, and commutation for quarters as per Army officers when on shore?

How about mileage?



Officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service now are paid as follows:

Officer.	Salary.	Commutation per month.
Captains.....	\$2,500	\$40
First lieutenants, chief engineer.....	1,800	30
Second lieutenants, first assistant engineer.....	1,500	25
Third lieutenants, second assistant engineer.....	1,200	20

In addition, each officer gets a Navy ration. A Navy ration equals 30 cents per day.

Section 3 proposes to increase salary of third lieutenant and second assistant engineer from \$1,200, as now paid, to \$1,400. It also increases the pay of all Revenue-Cutter Service officers 10 per cent for each five years' service until the increase is 40 per cent.

The salaries paid in the Revenue-Cutter Service are already higher than those paid in the merchant marine or in any of the vessel service of the United States outside of the Navy. This section would pay to Revenue-Cutter Service officers a higher salary than is now received for corresponding rank in the Navy. The bill selects Army officers as the basis of fixing salary for the Revenue-Cutter Service officers because there is no reduction given in the pay of Army officers when on shore. Salaries of Navy officers are reduced 15 per cent when on shore. The bill therefore as to salaries discriminates in favor of the Revenue-Cutter Service and against the Navy and grants to the Revenue-Cutter Service higher rates of pay than are now paid even in the Navy.

Section 4 proposes a retired list in the Revenue-Cutter Service and proposes to retire all Revenue-Cutter Service officers who reach the age of 64 years. There is now no regular retired list in any of the civil branches of the Government service. Congress is being urged by every branch of the civil service to enact legislation providing for the retirement on pay of persons incapacitated through malady or age all through the civil service. At least one-tenth of the employees in the classified service of the departments in Washington are above the age of retirement fixed in this section. To a certain degree this is true of the Government service throughout the land. The question as to what disposition should be made of superannuated clerks is a pressing one.

Whatever precedent is set in one case will likely be followed in the others. The Life-Saving Service, the Light-House Service, the Marine-Hospital Service, as well as the purely clerical service of the Government are all asking for the same thing, or making requests which will be toward the same thing. If a line can not be drawn by Congress between the Navy on one side and the Revenue-Cutter Service on the other, it is idle to suppose that Congress will draw a fixed line between the military establishment and the Revenue-Cutter Service on one side and the Life-Saving Service and other branches of the civil service on the other. The only place where a fixed line can be drawn in regard to the creation of retired lists is where it now is—between the military and civil branches of the Government. If this line be crossed once, there will never be any line drawn which can not be crossed at all.

Section 5 provides for the appointment of a medical board of five commissioned officers, two from the Marine-Hospital Service and two from the Revenue-Cutter Service, to pass upon the disability of officers who appear to be incapacitated for active service prior to reaching the age of 64. This retiring board ought to consist wholly of medical officers and wholly of officers outside of the Revenue-Cutter Service. The Revenue-Cutter Service officers ought not to have the opportunity to retire each other either as a matter of favor or of enmity. The question whether an officer is incapacitated for the service, either mentally or physically, is a matter which ought to be determined by medical experts. The provision of section 5 in this respect is very objectionable.

Section 6 provides that when a retiring board finds an officer incapacitated for active service, etc., he shall be retired. The word "active" ought to be stricken out before the word "service." If the officer is capable of performing service, he might properly be designated for some of the duties of the service which do not require active sea service. The construction of this section undoubtedly would be that if the officer were incapacitated for active service in command of a revenue cutter at sea, then he must be retired, whereas such officer might be fully fit for duty as inspector in the Life-Saving Service or in the office in Washington or on construction or repair work. The whole design of these retirement sections is to retire the officers as rapidly as possible in order to make more rapid promotions in the service.

Section 7 provides that where an officer is incapacitated by reason of his own vicious habits and not due to any incident of the service, he shall be dropped from the service. The present section is quite a commentary upon the section in the bill in the

last Congress, which proposed to advance such officer, upon being dropped for his own vicious habits, a considerable sum of money.

Section 8 provides that when any commissioned officer is retired, the next officer in rank shall be promoted, "according to the established rules of the service." What are the established rules of the service? Who knows?

Or is this a proposition to enact into law a rule which has been promulgated or which may be hereafter promulgated by an officer in the service? No one here can tell what the present rules are, and no one can possibly tell what the established rules of the future may be. The latter part of the section contains a provision that although the next officer in rank shall be promoted where one is retired, before this can be done he shall be subject to written examination and shall have his physical qualifications reported upon by a medical board. The section does not require that the officer shall pass the written examination or that the medical board shall find favorably as to his physical qualifications. And the wording of the section might require the promotion of the officer even though mentally incompetent and physically incapacitated. The section is loosely drawn and does not require what it was intended to require.

Section 9 proposes to pay all officers hereafter placed upon the retired list 75 per cent of the duty pay, salary, and increase of the rank upon which they may be retired.

What does duty pay, salary, and increase of the rank mean?

Is there any difference between duty pay and salary; and if so, what is it?

Apparently the section is designed to give to the officers on the retired list 75 per cent of the increased pay provided for in section 3. This section also applies to officers already upon the permanent waiting-orders list. Congress passed an act in 1895, at the urgent solicitation of the Revenue-Cutter Service, providing for placing a number of officers on a permanent waiting-orders list at half pay. This was then satisfactory to the Revenue-Cutter Service and to these officers. This section would more than double the pay these officers are now receiving. When the Navy personnel bill was passed granting certain special benefits to officers who might be retired in the Navy, those special benefits were not conferred upon officers already upon the retired list. But this section proposes not only to create a retired list in the future at high pay, but to apply that high pay to officers who, on their own solicitation, have heretofore been retired at half pay.

BILLS FOR INCREASE OF SALARIES PENDING MARCH 1, 1902, IN THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS.

S. 943. To reclassify railway postal clerks and to increase their salaries.

H. R. 27. To reclassify railway postal clerks and divide them into ten classes and to increase their salaries.

S. 1345. To classify post-office clerks and to grant them an annual increase in salary of \$100 per annum.

H. R. 5286. To provide for the classification of salaries of clerks employed in first and second class post-offices and to increase the salaries of such clerks.

H. R. 5597. To increase the compensation of fourth-class postmasters.

S. 237. To increase the pay of letter carriers.

H. R. 2575. To increase the pay of letter carriers.

H. R. 6279. To increase the pay of letter carriers.

H. R. 6548. To increase the pay of letter carriers in cities to \$1,200 per annum and to increase the pay of rural carriers to \$1,000 per annum.

H. R. 7213. To increase the pay of letter carriers.

S. 3287. To increase the pay of judges of the Supreme Court and other courts of the United States.

H. R. 205. To increase the salaries of judges of the Supreme Court and other courts of the United States.

H. R. 5816. To increase the salaries of the Vice-President, judges of the Supreme Court, and members of Congress.

H. R. 6284. To increase the salary of the Vice-President to \$25,000 and Cabinet officers to \$15,000 per annum.

S. 1026. To increase the compensation of district superintendents in the Life-Saving Service.

H. R. 76. To increase the compensation of district superintendents in the Life-Saving Service.

H. R. 197. To increase the compensation of district superintendents in the Life-Saving Service.

H. R. —. To grant an increase of 10 per cent for each five years' service to all persons in the classified service.

BILLS FOR RETIRED LISTS AND PENSIONS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE PENDING IN THE FIFTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS MARCH 1, 1902.

S. 1902. A bill granting pensions to employees in the Life-Saving Service disabled by disease or injury, and to the widows and minor children of employees in the service who die from injury or disease contracted in the service, and for the purpose of the act to rank a superintendent in the Life-Saving Service with a captain in the Navy, etc.

H. R. 163. Granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service and to their widows and minor children, and declaring the rank of superintendent in the Life-Saving Service for the purposes of the act to be equivalent to that of captain in the Navy, etc.

H. R. 4377. To retire on full pay certain class of disabled persons from the United States Light-House Service.

H. R. 7476. To provide for the retirement of all Government employees in the classified civil service on pay, and fixing the pay to be received by persons on the retired list, no person to receive over \$1,500 per annum.

H. R. 8741. To create a commission to provide for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service because of superannuation and to require persons entering the classified service to effect life insurance for the payment of annuities after reaching the age of retirement.

H. R. 10155. To provide for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service on certain rates of pay and for the establishment of a retirement bureau.

H. R. 10156. Entitled "A bill to increase the efficiency of the public service



by retirement of disabled and superannuated employees" and providing for retirement of civil employees for disability, or after thirty years' service, on annual pay equal to 75 per cent of the average for the five years preceding retirement.

H. R. 4800. Providing for the retirement of Army officers who served in the civil war upon a rank one grade above the active rank. This follows the line of the Navy personnel bill in this respect.

#### VARIOUS STATEMENTS SHOWING THE AGES OF PERSONS EMPLOYED IN THE VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS IN WASHINGTON IN APRIL, 1900.

##### THE PRESIDENT:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of March 16, 1900, calling upon the heads of the several Executive Departments to communicate "at the earliest practicable date statements showing the number of persons employed in their respective departments and bureaus as clerks, messengers, etc., of the following ages: Number between 14 and 19, inclusive; between 20 and 29, inclusive; between 30 and 39, inclusive; between 40 and 49, inclusive; between 50 and 59, inclusive; between 60 and 64, inclusive; between 65 and 69, inclusive; between 70 and 74, inclusive; between 75 and 79, inclusive, and above 80; also the number now on the rolls, in the respective departments and bureaus, who are permanently incapacitated, either physically or mentally, for the performance of manual labor, in whole or in part," the undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to report as follows:

There are at present in the employ of the Department of State as clerks, messengers, etc., 91 persons. Of these, none is between the ages of 14 and 19; 18 are between the ages of 20 and 29; 13 between the ages of 30 and 39; 25 between the ages of 40 and 49; 20 between the ages of 50 and 59; 6 between the ages of 60 and 64; 6 between the ages of 65 and 69; 1 between the ages of 70 and 74; 2 between the ages of 75 and 79, and none is above the age of 80. None of them are permanently incapacitated, either physically or mentally, for the performance of manual labor.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN HAY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, April 4, 1900.

#### TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, Washington, April 10, 1900.

SIR: In response to the resolution of the Senate of March 16, 1900, calling for information as to the ages of the employees of this Department, and also the number of employees now on the rolls who are permanently incapacitated, either physically or mentally, for the performance of manual labor, in whole or in part, I have the honor to report as follows:

Number of employees:	
Between 14 and 19 years.....	9
Between 20 and 29 years.....	945
Between 30 and 39 years.....	1,053
Between 40 and 49 years.....	844
Between 50 and 59 years.....	903
Between 60 and 64 years.....	331
Between 65 and 69 years.....	160
Between 70 and 74 years.....	56
Between 75 and 79 years.....	24
Over 80 years.....	10
Total.....	4,338

#### WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, April 5, 1900.

SIR: In response to Senate resolution of March 16, 1900, I have the honor to transmit herewith a statement showing by specified ages the number of regular employees in the War Department, and to report that 29 employees have a physical disability, as will be noted from the inclosed statement, which probably renders them unable for the performance of some kinds of manual labor; but that no employee of the Department is permanently incapacitated, either physically or mentally, for the performance of manual labor involved in the duties to which assigned.

Very respectfully,

G. D. MEIKLEJOHN,  
Assistant Secretary of War.

The PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE UNITED STATES SENATE.

#### Number of regular employees in the War Department between specified ages.

Bureau or office.	14 and 19 years.	20 and 29 years.	30 and 39 years.	40 and 49 years.	50 and 59 years.	60 and 64 years.	65 and 69 years.	70 and 74 years.	75 and 79 years.	Over 80 years.	Total.
Secretary of War.....	15	15	10	19	5	4	—	—	—	—	68
Record and Pension.....	27	100	88	150	60	32	10	2	1	—	470
Adjutant-General.....	11	19	19	45	21	16	3	1	—	—	195
Inspector-General.....	1	3	4	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	11
Judge-Advocate-General.....	2	5	3	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	12
Quartermaster-General.....	1	8	25	15	42	15	7	3	—	1	117
Commissary-General of Subsistence.....	1	7	9	7	5	6	1	—	—	—	36
Surgeon-General.....	9	25	18	38	12	12	1	3	—	—	118
Paymaster-General.....	1	—	—	15	7	—	—	1	—	—	25
Chief of Engineers.....	6	22	19	4	5	—	—	1	—	—	76
Chief of Ordnance.....	5	7	13	8	5	4	1	—	—	—	43
Chief Signal Officer.....	—	1	3	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	5
Total.....	1	86	229	201	344	138	87	20	7	3	1,116

\* Of this number 89 are laborers.

#### POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL, Washington, D. C., March 24, 1900.

SIR: In response to the resolution of the Senate requesting information as to the number of persons employed in the several bureaus of this Department between certain specified ages, and also the number now on the rolls of this Department who are permanently incapacitated, either physically or

mentally, for the performance of manual labor in whole or in part, I have the honor to reply as follows:

Between the ages of—	
14 and 19, inclusive.....	2
20 and 29, inclusive.....	68
30 and 39, inclusive.....	187
40 and 49, inclusive.....	159
50 and 59, inclusive.....	162
60 and 64, inclusive.....	54
65 and 69, inclusive.....	18
70 and 74, inclusive.....	13
75 and 79, inclusive.....	3
Over 80.....	4
Incapacitated in whole or part.....	6
Total.....	676

Very respectfully,

CH. EMORY SMITH,  
Postmaster-General.

#### NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, March 28, 1900.

SIR: In reply to the resolution of the United States Senate of March 16, 1900, I have the honor to report that the number of clerks, messengers, etc., employed in the Navy Department, between the ages named herein below, are as follows:

Between 14 and 19, inclusive.....	9
Between 20 and 29, inclusive.....	118
Between 30 and 39, inclusive.....	144
Between 40 and 49, inclusive.....	81
Between 50 and 59, inclusive.....	66
Between 60 and 64, inclusive.....	20
Between 65 and 69, inclusive.....	7
Between 70 and 74, inclusive.....	7
Between 75 and 79, inclusive.....	5
Above 80.....	1
Total employees.....	458

Average age:	
458 employees.....	39.21
393 males.....	38.61
65 females.....	42.86

The different chiefs of bureaus and offices report that there are no employees in their respective bureaus or offices who are permanently incapacitated, either physically or mentally, for the performance of manual labor, in whole or in part.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, Secretary.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D. C., April 12, 1900.

SIR: In reply to Senate resolution dated March 16, 1900, directing me to communicate to the Senate statement showing the number of persons employed in this Department as clerks, messengers, etc., together with their ages, I have the honor to submit herewith the following statement, viz:

	Departmental (nonex-cepted).	United States penitentiary, Kansas (nonex-cepted).	Miscellaneous (ex-cepted).	Total.
Between the ages—				
14 and 19.....	14	8	2	24
20 and 29.....	26	25	15	66
30 and 39.....	21	22	10	53
40 and 49.....	22	13	5	40
50 and 59.....	3	3	3	9
60 and 64.....	4	—	—	4
65 and 69.....	2	—	—	2
70 and 74.....	1	—	—	1
75 and 79.....	—	—	—	—
Total.....	—	—	—	199

There are none on the rolls of this Department who are permanently incapacitated, either physically or mentally, for the purpose of manual labor, in whole or in part.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. GRIGGS,  
Attorney-General.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Washington, April 12, 1900.

SIR: In compliance with the requirements of a resolution of the Senate of March 16, 1900, I have the honor to report the number of employees within the several age periods specified. The total number of persons belonging to this Department (excluding the Census Office) may be stated, in round numbers, as 14,500. Of these the departmental employees in this city are, approximately, 3,500. Excluding Presidential appointees and laborers, there remain 3,255 to whom the resolution seems to apply, as follows:

Between—	
14 and 19 years, inclusive.....	33
20 and 29 years, inclusive.....	303
30 and 39 years, inclusive.....	833
40 and 49 years, inclusive.....	718
50 and 59 years, inclusive.....	815
60 and 64 years, inclusive.....	301
65 and 69 years, inclusive.....	162
70 and 74 years, inclusive.....	58
75 and 79 years, inclusive.....	28
Over 80 years.....	4
Total.....	3,255

From the estimates furnished by the different bureaus and offices of the Department it may be stated that something over 250 persons now on the rolls must be considered as "permanently incapacitated, either physically or mentally, for the performance of manual labor, in whole or in part." This condition in many cases results from the loss of limbs, old wounds, or health impaired in the service.

A tabular statement by offices is inclosed.

Very respectfully,

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Secretary.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1900.

SIR: In compliance with the resolution of the Senate of the United States of March 18, 1900, directing the heads of the Executive Departments "to communicate to the Senate, at the earliest practicable day, statements showing the number of persons employed in their respective departments and bureaus, as clerks, messengers, etc., of the following ages: Number between 14 and 19, inclusive; between 20 and 29, inclusive; between 30 and 39, inclusive; between 40 and 49, inclusive; between 50 and 59, inclusive; between 60 and 64, inclusive; between 65 and 69, inclusive; between 70 and 74, inclusive; between 75 and 79, inclusive, and above 80; also the number now on the rolls in the respective departments and bureaus who are permanently incapacitated, either physically or mentally, for the performance of manual labor, in whole or in part," I have the honor to transmit the following statement, which is the result of a very careful investigation carried out under my direction by the appointment clerk of this Department:

Number in Washington:

Between 14 and 19, inclusive	23
Between 20 and 29, inclusive	201
Between 30 and 39, inclusive	220
Between 40 and 49, inclusive	179
Between 50 and 59, inclusive	141
Between 60 and 64, inclusive	40
Between 65 and 69, inclusive	17
Between 70 and 74, inclusive	9
Between 75 and 79, inclusive	4
Above 80	0
Total	894

Outside of Washington:

Between 14 and 19, inclusive	62
Between 20 and 29, inclusive	613
Between 30 and 39, inclusive	637
Between 40 and 49, inclusive	481
Between 50 and 59, inclusive	252
Between 60 and 64, inclusive	63
Between 65 and 69, inclusive	32
Between 70 and 74, inclusive	18
Between 75 and 79, inclusive	8
Above 80	4
Total	2,120

Total in entire Department, in and out of Washington, D. C.:

Between 14 and 19, inclusive	85
Between 20 and 29, inclusive	814
Between 30 and 39, inclusive	857
Between 40 and 49, inclusive	610
Between 50 and 59, inclusive	393
Between 60 and 64, inclusive	103
Between 65 and 69, inclusive	49
Between 70 and 74, inclusive	27
Between 75 and 79, inclusive	12
Above 80	4
Total	2,954

The number now on the rolls in the Department of Agriculture who are permanently incapacitated, either physically or mentally, for the performance of manual labor, in whole or in part, is 10, and these are rendered so by reason of a loss of an arm or a limb while in the military service of the United States.

Very respectfully,

JAMES WILSON,  
Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

THE LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.

The special claim made in behalf of a retired or pension list for the Revenue-Cutter Service is that that service is particularly dangerous. Even if we admit this to be true for the sake of argument, we must further admit that the specially dangerous service in behalf of the Government does not end with the Army, Navy, and Revenue-Cutter Service. An equally strong claim can be made in behalf of the Life-Saving Service. Indeed, there have been pending before Congress for years various propositions to create a pension list for the Life-Saving Service. The General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service has reported to Congress that between March 1, 1876, and December 31, 1887, 57 persons died by reason of injury received or disease contracted in line of duty in that service, and the records of his department show that between January 1, 1888, and December 31, 1900, 105 persons have died by reason of injury received or disease contracted in line of duty in the service.

And the following statements have been made as among the reasons for increasing the compensation to employees in the Life-Saving Service and for providing a pension list for them (see Senate Report No. 87, first session, Fifty-second Congress):

When the severe toils, bitter privations, and appalling dangers incident to their calling are considered, and when it is remembered that the spirit with which these hardships have been met has resulted in the saving of thousands of lives and an amount of property many times exceeding in value the cost of maintaining the service, while the history of their achievements has added lustre to the national honor, it would seem that the higher rates would not be too great a reward to bestow on these faithful and heroic men. At all events, a substantial increase should be made.

As a consequence of their exposure many of the men have fallen victims to chronic ailments, some have been maimed for life by accidents, and others have perished on their beats. It is probably safe to say that there is no other class of men engaged in duties at once so tedious and perilous as those which these faithful guardians of the coast perform in maintaining the unrelenting night patrol throughout the rigorous season of the year. But their labors are not confined to this routine of watch patrol and daily drill. Summoned in the dead of night or by day in the midst of their ordinary toil to a duty higher than these, by an alarm that a vessel is ashore, they take their

places at the boat wagon or the apparatus cart for a supreme effort, with a courage and determination that has never yet quailed before any hazard, and executed prodigies of valor and endurance that have made them celebrated throughout the land and added to the nation's glory.

The severity of this duty can hardly be conceived by people accustomed to remain at night indoors. Some idea may be framed from the fact that men have perished in its discharge, while others have providentially escaped death through timely rescue by their comrades. It is not at all unusual for the patrolmen to meet with accidents which cripple them through stumbling in the dark over driftwood and unseen obstacles, and a large proportion of the deaths which have occurred in the service is due to complaints contracted through exposure on patrol, it frequently happening during the prevalence of storms that the men are drenched by overflooding seas or by having to wade through the beach gullies, often waist deep and sometimes deeper. This duty is considered so important that it is never under any circumstances omitted, and its infraction is held to be unpardonable and is followed by certain dismissal.

In addition to the foregoing regular routine must be added their terrible and daring labors at shipwreck. This, of course, is their crowning duty, and involves efforts almost superhuman, heroism carried to the very brink of deadly peril, and often death itself.

The soldier in this age is known and is only justified as one who professionally stakes his life in defense of his fellow-citizens. It is because he does this that, grown veteran or infirm or falling on the battlefield, we recognize his right and the right of his family to support at the expense of the public he guards. These life-saving crews—these storm soldiers—render a similar service, and no less dangerous and noble, and they deserve the same substantial recognition.

In Senate Report No. 200, the present session of Congress, concerning a bill relating to compensation of district superintendents of the Life-Saving Service, there is included a letter from the General Superintendent of that service containing the following statement:

To these considerations should be added the fact that these officers, in their official routine, are exposed to hardships and dangers which do not fall to the lot of ordinary officeholders. During the active season, which embraces the most inclement portions of the year, they have to make frequent visits to the several stations in their respective districts, in most instances extending hundreds of miles along desolate and inhospitable coasts and distant from railroad facilities, often through storms and drifting snows, sometimes camping out and subsisting on rude and scanty fare, frequently making their way in small boats upon dangerous waters, and always under circumstances as widely at variance as is conceivable with the comforts and luxuries of ordinary travel. They are, moreover, frequently summoned by the keepers to trying scenes of shipwreck, where all efforts at rescue have proved fruitless and certain failure seems imminent, and on these occasions they assume command. In several such instances successful issues have resulted, when otherwise failure must have been inevitable. But their heroic struggles are not always so rewarded, nor are the hardships and perils of their calling always encountered with immunity. \* \* \*

The assertion is ventured that no other class of officers in the whole Government is so poorly paid.

THE WEATHER BUREAU.

The Committee on Agriculture in the Fifty-sixth Congress reported favorably a bill creating a retired list or civil pension list for Weather Bureau employees, and the following were some of the reasons urged in behalf of such employees:

(1) They work three hundred and sixty-five days in a year. Their hours of duty are long. On the Pacific coast the first observation is made between 4.30 and 5.30 a. m., while on the Atlantic coast the offices can not be closed before 11 p. m., and often later. They must be on the alert at all times to detect the first premonitions of storm development and remain constantly on duty in order to distribute warnings that may be received at any moment.

(2) They are subject to great vicissitudes of climate, being required to serve, as the exigencies of the service may require, in almost any degree of latitude, from Alaska to the West Indies.

(3) By reason of the peculiar organization of the service its employees are, like officers of the Army, in a great measure deterred from obtaining a fixed habitation or enjoying the privileges that accrue to long residence in a community. Changes of station generally operate to their financial disadvantage.

THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

The Marine-Hospital Service is probably fully as dangerous, if not more so, than the Revenue-Cutter Service. I called the attention of the House, in February, 1901, on the discussion of the revenue-cutter bill then pending, to the fact that three assistant surgeons of the Marine-Hospital Service had contracted yellow fever during the fiscal year then preceding, and to the further fact that one surgeon had died of this disease October 12, 1899, while engaged in the work of preventing its spread in Key West. In the case of a death like this in that service, there is no provision of law authorizing the payment of any sum to the family of the deceased or permitting any of those dependent upon the deceased to be placed upon the pension rolls.

But that the Marine-Hospital Service lives in expectation of eventually having all the benefits of a retired list and other special favors enjoyed by the Army and Navy is readily shown by the bill (H. R. 7189) introduced into the Fifty-seventh Congress by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] to increase the efficiency and change the name of the United States Marine-Hospital Service. That bill proposes to change the name so as to designate the service as the United States health service. It proposes that the surgeon-general of the United States health service shall receive the same salary and allowances as are now allowed to be paid to the Surgeon-General of the Army.

And section 4 of the bill provides that the President may in time of war transfer the officers of this health service to the Army, as he can now transfer the Revenue-Cutter Service to the Navy.



The Revenue-Cutter Service now demands a retired list like the Navy, because the President is authorized in time of emergency to transfer revenue cutters to the Navy. If this bill for the Marine-Hospital Service or United States health service becomes a law, then that service will demand a retired list, because the President is authorized in times of emergency to use the officers of the service in connection with the Army.

## RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

The General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, in his annual report for 1901, furnishes the following statement of casualties in that service from 1875 to 1901:

Year ended June 30—	Total clerks.	Casualties.	Clerks killed.	Clerks seriously injured.	Clerks slightly injured.
1875	2,238		1		
1876	2,415		1		
1877	2,500	27	2	10	4
1878	2,608	36	2	15	3
1879	2,609	35	3	14	13
1880	2,946	26		14	15
1881	3,177	62	7	15	22
1882	3,570	83	3	16	20
1883	3,855	114	1	35	42
1884	3,963	154	7	28	60
1885	4,387	102	2	25	65
1886	4,573	211		56	60
1887	4,851	244	5	45	72
1888	5,084	248	4	63	45
1889	5,448	193	10	95	40
1890	5,836	261	4	41	53
1891	6,022	219	13	68	84
1892	6,417	345	5	60	112
1893	6,645	403	10	66	115
1894	6,856	362	4	48	99
1895	7,045	497	7	50	128
1896	7,408	495	5	47	65
1897	7,573	589	14	33	75
1898	7,999	597	7	34	146
1899	8,388	799	6	50	162
1900	8,695	697	4	57	187
1901	8,978	825	7	63	229

This statement shows that during the fiscal year of 1901 7 railway mail clerks were killed, 63 seriously injured, and 229 slightly injured while on duty. This is stated to be the largest number killed and injured during any fiscal year since the service was organized, notwithstanding the fact that great improvements have been effected in railroad operations.

Superintendent White most earnestly urges legislation which will provide for the retirement of injured or superannuated clerks on pension, and he calls attention to the fact that that service has been for some time urging a pension list, just as the Revenue-Cutter Service has, in the following language:

That this office has been very persistent in its efforts to secure some legislation, in the way of a relief bill or superannuation act, to provide for our permanently disabled and worn-out clerks has been shown in the recommendations it has made in its annual reports for the last ten years.

And, referring to the bill which was introduced in Congress for the purpose of granting a pension to railway mail clerks, Superintendent White says:

In its favor is the admission of everyone who gives the nature of the occupation consideration that the service is very hazardous. The work of a postal clerk is performed under a high tension, drawing largely on his mental and physical make-up, and after years of this constant strain he is completely worn out. It seems, therefore, evident that some provision should be made for his retirement, which now involves the relinquishment of all means of support.

[From the Evening Star, January 10, 1902.]

The railway mail clerks hope for favorable action at this session of Congress upon their bill to enable them to secure retirement upon disability and other measures of relief, and in discussing the bill this morning with a Star representative, J. H. BROWELL, of Ohio, an active member of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, who has ably championed the cause of the clerks, said:

"I sincerely hope that Congress will give heed to the request of these faithful men, who are of invaluable service to the public, yet who, shut up in their postal cars, are seldom seen. The letter carrier is a familiar sight, but the railway-mail clerk works at his hazardous occupation with a zeal and industry which only those who have been brought into close contact with him can appreciate."

## REVENUE AGENTS.

WASHINGTON, February 27, 1902.

HON. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your letter of the 24th instant is received, asking if this office has record of the number of internal-revenue officers injured or killed in the performance of their duty during the past year, or for several years past.

In reply I have the honor to inform you that during the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1901, one internal-revenue deputy collector was killed and two wounded in the performance of official duty.

During the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1900, there were no casualties. During the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1899, two posse men were wounded.

During the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1898, one deputy collector and four posse men were wounded.

Posse men are not officials regularly employed in this Bureau, but they are men summoned by a deputy collector to aid him in making raids, and they are paid a fixed per diem while employed.

You further ask if there is any provision of law for the payment of com-

pensation on account of officers who may be killed or may be so injured as to be unable to continue in the performance of their duties. In reply you are advised that this office regrets to state that no provision of law has been made for compensation in these cases. \* \* \*

I am, respectfully, yours,

J. W. YERKES, Commissioner.

## DEPUTY MARSHALS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1902.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,

House of Representatives.

SIR: Referring to your letter dated the 24th instant, you are informed that it would be very difficult (if possible) to ascertain from the records of this Department the number of deputy United States marshals who have been injured while in the performance of duty during the past year or for several years back.

There is no provision made for the payment of compensation where deputy marshals have been killed or so injured as to be unable to continue in the performance of their duties. The killing of deputy marshals in some districts is of frequent occurrence. This is especially true in the mountain districts of the South.

Respectfully,

P. C. KNOX, Attorney-General.

## TWO REVENUE OFFICERS KILLED BY MOONSHINERS—BLOODY BATTLE FOUGHT IN THE MOUNTAINS OF KENTUCKY.

LEXINGTON, Ky., January 27, 1901.

The bloodiest battle in the history of the State between moonshiners and revenue officers occurred January 25 on Elkhorn Creek, on the line between Pike and Knott counties. Deputy Marshal James Hollifield and Simon Combs, of the revenue party, were killed. Rufus Wootton and Ambrose Ambury, of the posse, received flesh wounds, and Blaine Combs was captured. As none of the revenue party escaped, reports received have been meager. Elkhorn Creek is 30 miles from the nearest railroad station and in a rough mountain country. A strong force of revenue officers will be sent after the 'shiners.

## UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D. C., February 28, 1902.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,

United States House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 24th instant requesting to be informed whether any bill has been introduced into the House or Senate designed to carry out the wishes of our association has been received.

I regret to state that we have been unable as yet to present our measure. The delay has been caused by a number of circumstances, chief among which has been the difficulty in obtaining accurate and reliable data from which to base the measure. We hope, however, to have a bill introduced in the near future, and we will promptly notify you of the fact and send you an advanced copy of the proposed measure.

Secretary United States Civil Service Retirement Association.

## CLERKS' PENSION PROJECT—BILL BEING DRAFTED TO RETIRE AGED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—PROPOSED SYSTEM OF CARING FOR LIFELONG WORKERS BEING FORMULATED BY COMMITTEE IN CHARGE.

For several weeks the rooms of the executive committee of the United States Civil Service Retirement Association, in the Evans Building, 1424 New York avenue, have been the scene of great activity. This committee is composed of the president of the association, Jacob W. Starr, Vice-Presidents Pickens Neagle and Solomon E. Faunce, Secretary John E. Brooks, Treasurer Henry C. Swan, and Robert Armour, W. W. Hite, Raymond Loran, George W. Harsch, E. A. Edifford, C. H. Campbell, Joseph Stewart, David A. Caldwell, George A. Bacon, Darius A. Green, A. F. McMillan, C. E. Baldwin, and Israel W. Stone, representing all the Executive Departments and independent bureaus in this city, and is charged by the association with formulating and presenting a bill to Congress which shall have for its object the retirement of the superannuated employees not only of the civil service in Washington, but also of the force in the United States at large, such as the post-offices, custom-houses, subtreasuries, etc.

To that end its labor has been unremitting and laborious. The regular meetings of the committee are held on Saturday evening, at which much business of a routine nature is acted on and conferences are held over propositions submitted for consideration. A large amount of correspondence is had with somewhat similar organizations throughout the country—from Boston to San Francisco and from Detroit to New Orleans—and the secretary is kept busy in answering the scores of inquiries coming in from all quarters.

The labors of the committee, while pleasurable, have been somewhat onerous. As early as the second session of the last Congress it succeeded in having a resolution pass the Senate calling upon the Executive Departments for such detailed information as would enable it to formulate a bill to present to the present Congress. Information was so furnished by the Executive Departments, but owing to the difference of interpretation as to the details desired much of it could not be used. Therefore at its own expense it had some 30,000 cards printed, which, by the kindness of the heads of departments, were placed on the desk of each employee, and collected and sent to the committee rooms. The card required of each employee his or her age on birthday preceding July 1, 1901, present salary per annum, total years of Government service, exclusive of military or naval, and the name of the department where now employed.

There have been more than 20,000 of these cards received, and the committee have them nearly all assorted. This has taken much time and labor, the members often working until a late hour in the evening. In making this assortment each card has been handled from three to five times, so that when finally placed upon the assorting boards it can be tabulated with but one more handling. Quite a number of matters have developed which would be exceedingly interesting to statisticians, but the committee has concluded not to make public this tabulation, at least not until after a bill has been formulated, when a statement will be probably forwarded to the proper committees of the House and Senate, accompanied by the report of a reputable actuary, who will be employed to ascertain what can be done with the figures as given.

The committee has a lively appreciation of the fact that their friends in the service are anxious to learn what the result of its labors will be, and expectantly hoping to see a bill introduced at this session. Much encouragement has been given by such Congressmen and public officials as have knowledge of what the committee has done, and such as have visited the committee rooms have manifested a great degree of interest in its undertaking. It seems to be the universal sentiment of these two classes of officials that something must be done to relieve the civil service of superannuated employees and at the same time provide some method by which these faithful servants shall be relieved from penury and want.



## VARIOUS PENSION PLANS IN PRIVATE LIFE—PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY.

All officers and employees who shall have attained the age of 70 years, or who, between the ages of 65 and 70, have become physically incapacitated, and who have been for thirty years in the service of the company, are entitled to a pension of 1 per cent of the average regular monthly pay for ten years preceding retirement for each year of service. The company sets aside an amount not to exceed \$300,000 a year to meet the pension allowances, and whenever the pensions amount to more than that then they are to be scaled down to come within that sum.

## CHICAGO AND NORTHWESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY.

The age of retirement, length of service, and amount of pension is the same as in the Pennsylvania Railroad scheme, but the amount set apart by the company shall not exceed \$300,000 a year. And when the pensions exceed that amount a new rate is to be established to bring it within that sum.

## ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY.

All officers and employees who reach the age of 70 years and have been ten years in the service of the company shall be retired on pension. Men connected with the actual operation of trains, such as engineers, firemen, brakemen, switchmen, etc., may be retired at the age of 65. Persons between 61 and 70, who have been ten years in the service and who have become incapacitated, may be retired on pension. The amount of the pension is for each year of service 1 per cent of the average monthly pay received for the ten years preceding retirement. The company makes a yearly appropriation of \$100,000, and whenever the pension allowances exceed that sum they are to be ratably reduced.

## FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF CHICAGO.

Officers and employees contribute 3 per cent of their salaries to the pension fund. Pensions are granted when the age of 60 years is reached after fifteen years' service in the bank, and employees are compelled to retire at the age of 65. Pension allowed is one-fiftieth or 2 per cent of the salary paid at the date of retirement, for each year of service, provided that in no case should it exceed thirty-five-fiftieths or 70 per cent of such salary. Other restrictions concerning the pension fund are imposed.

## EUROPEAN INSURANCE COMPANIES.

In Europe it is stated that there are insurance companies which make a specialty of writing pension policies. One of the leading insurance companies in this class of business is the Wilhelma-Magdeburg, which issues policies to employees between the ages of 21 and 40 years, inclusive. The annual premiums equal 10 per cent of the yearly salary of the insured employee at the time of effecting the insurance, and, in addition, 4 per cent of each increase of salary, which is, however, only to be paid once. Pensions are paid when an employee is injured so as to be unable to work, after five years' service, or when he becomes 65 years of age. Pensions are also paid to widows and minor children up to the age of 18 years. The amount of the pension paid is equal to ten-sixtieths of the average yearly salary drawn and, in addition, one-sixtieth of such average yearly salary for each year of service above five years, but the whole pension is not to exceed forty-five sixtieths of such average yearly salary.

## THE MITTEL-DEUTSCH CREDIT BANK.

Each employee pays an initiation fee of 5 per cent of his yearly salary when he enters the service and 5 per cent of each increase of his salary, and then pays as yearly dues 3 per cent of his salary up to 3,000 marks and 4 per cent in excess of 3,000 marks up to 4,000 marks. An employee who has served twenty-five years and has passed his sixty-fifth year is entitled to a pension. The amount of the pension is based upon 34 per cent of the last-drawn salary for ten years' service; 1 per cent additional for each year of the second ten-years' service and 2 per cent additional for each year of service above twenty years' service; provided that the total pension shall not exceed 2,400 marks per year. There are various other provisions and details concerning this pension scheme.

## THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT.

In general, the German Government grants pension for each employee of the Government if, after a service of at least ten years, he becomes incapacitated. Or if he is injured while on duty, he is entitled to a pension even if the service is less than ten years. The rate of pension is twenty-eighthieths of the salary for ten years' service, and an additional one-eighthieth for each ensuing year of service, but shall not exceed sixty-eighthieths.

## RETIRED LIST IN THE ARMY.

In the Army there are two retired lists—one the limited retired list, and the other the unlimited retired list. The limited list is limited by act of Congress to 350, and on it are placed officers who are retired prior to the age of 64 years, such as those retired for physical disability or for length of service. When officers on the limited list become 64 years of age they are transferred to the unlimited list.

The unlimited list consists of officers who are retired on account of reaching the age of 64 years.

## RETIRED LIST IN THE NAVY.

In the Navy, under sections 1443, 1444, and 1445 of the Revised Statutes, officers above the grade of lieutenant, commander and below the rank of vice-admiral shall be retired on reaching the age of 62 and may be retired upon their own application after forty years' service. Under the personnel bill, approved March 3, 1899, a limited number of officers of the grades of captain, commander, and lieutenant-commander may be retired upon their own application under section 8, and under the provisions named in section 9 there may, under certain circumstances, be compulsorily retired not more than 5 captains, 4 commanders, 4 lieutenant-commanders, and 2 lieutenants in any one year.

Officers may also be retired for incapacity resulting from incidental service under act of August 3, 1861, and under certain conditions for physical disability under other acts.

In a report favoring the passage of this bill there is a statement showing the pay of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service under existing law and under the pending bill. This statement was presumably furnished by the Revenue-Cutter Service. It is misleading. It gives the pay table of officers under existing law as

\$374,600 and the pay table of the officers whose pay would be affected by the provisions of the pending bill under said bill at \$479,960. Both of these items relate to the active list; but in order to compute the last-named amount the statement excludes consideration of the officers who would be subject to retirement upon the passage of this bill, which of course makes the longevity pay less than it would otherwise be.

This, of course, was perfectly proper as to that statement, but in connection with it is the pay table of the officers on the permanent waiting-orders list, both under existing law and under the pending bill. This gives the pay of officers on the waiting-orders list under existing law at \$23,850 and under pending bill at \$50,925. But the latter figure does not include the pay of any officers who would be at once retired under the pending bill. The table contains a recapitulation of the pay of active and retired officers under existing law and under the pending bill, giving the former at \$398,450 and under the latter \$530,820. But this computation does not include the pay of officers who would be entitled to retirement at the time of the passage of the bill, and they are not considered in the statement given either in the active service or on the retired list, so that the item in said statement showing the annual increase by pending bill at \$132,370 is misleading and does not state the true facts or give the true increase.

Pay table as authorized under existing law.

## ACTIVE LIST.

	Annual salary.	Total.
37 captains, at.....	\$2,500.00	\$92,500.00
37 first lieutenants, at.....	1,800.00	66,600.00
37 second lieutenants, at.....	1,500.00	55,500.00
37 third lieutenants, at.....	1,200.00	44,400.00
1 captain of engineers, at.....	2,500.00	2,500.00
35 chief engineers, at.....	1,800.00	63,000.00
17 first assistant engineers, at.....	1,500.00	25,500.00
18 second assistant engineers, at.....	1,200.00	21,600.00
1 constructor, at.....	1,800.00	1,800.00
Total.....		373,400.00

## RETIRED AND WAITING-ORDERS LISTS.

1 captain, at.....	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
4 captains, at.....	1,250.00	5,000.00
4 first lieutenants, at.....	900.00	3,600.00
1 second lieutenant, at.....	750.00	750.00
1 third lieutenant, at.....	600.00	600.00
9 chief engineers, at.....	900.00	8,100.00
6 first assistant engineers, at.....	750.00	4,500.00
3 second assistant engineers, at.....	600.00	1,800.00
Total.....		26,850.00

## RECAPITULATION.

Total active list.....	\$373,400.00
Total retired and waiting-orders lists.....	26,850.00
Total.....	400,250.00

Pay table under proposed law for fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

## ACTIVE LIST.

	Annual salary.	Total.
37 captains, at.....	\$3,500.00	\$129,500.00
15 first lieutenants, at.....	2,520.00	37,800.00
7 first lieutenants, at.....	2,240.00	15,680.00
15 first lieutenants, at.....	2,160.00	32,400.00
13 second lieutenants, at.....	1,800.00	23,400.00
10 second lieutenants, at.....	1,650.00	16,500.00
14 second lieutenants, at.....	1,500.00	21,000.00
37 third lieutenants, at.....	1,400.00	51,800.00
1 captain of engineers, at.....	3,500.00	3,500.00
21 chief engineers, at.....	2,520.00	52,920.00
6 chief engineers, at.....	2,840.00	14,040.00
8 chief engineers, at.....	2,160.00	17,280.00
1 first assistant engineer, at.....	1,800.00	1,800.00
16 first assistant engineers, at.....	1,650.00	26,400.00
5 second assistant engineers, at.....	1,540.00	7,700.00
13 second assistant engineers, at.....	1,400.00	18,200.00
1 constructor, at.....	1,800.00	1,800.00
Total.....		472,420.00

## RETIRED LIST.

12 captains, at.....	\$2,625.00	\$31,500.00
15 chief engineers, at.....	1,890.00	28,350.00
4 first lieutenants, at.....	1,890.00	7,560.00
1 second lieutenant, at.....	1,462.50	1,462.50
1 third lieutenant, at.....	1,470.00	1,470.00
6 first assistant engineers, at.....	1,575.00	9,450.00
2 second assistant engineers, at.....	1,470.00	2,940.00
1 second assistant engineer, at.....	1,200.00	1,200.00
Total.....		83,022.50



## RECAPITULATION.

Total pay on active list	\$472,420.00
Total pay on retired list	83,992.50
Total	556,412.50
Total pay on active and retired lists under present law	400,250.00
Total pay on active and retired lists under proposed law	556,412.50

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 26, 1902.

SIR: The Bureau is in receipt of your letter of the 24th instant, requesting the rate of pay of a lieutenant-commander in the Navy who has a service of twenty years, both for sea duty and shore duty; and in reply thereto begs to inform you that an officer of this rank and service receives, while at sea, \$3,500, without any allowances, and on shore, in the United States, \$2,975 and quarters. If quarters are not furnished in kind, he is entitled to commutation thereof at the rate of \$48 per month.

Respectfully,

A. S. KENNY,

Paymaster-General United States Navy.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

## PAY IN THE NAVY.

Officers on the active list in the Navy receive the following rates of pay:

Lieutenant-commanders on sea duty	\$2,500
Lieutenant-commanders on shore duty	2,125
Lieutenants on sea duty	1,800
Lieutenants on shore duty	1,530
Lieutenants (junior grade) on sea duty	1,500
Lieutenants (junior grade) on shore duty	1,275
Ensigns on sea duty	1,400
Ensigns on shore duty	1,190

VARIOUS STATEMENTS AND LETTERS SHOWING COMPARISONS BETWEEN SALARIES PAID TO REVENUE-CUTTER OFFICERS AND SALARIES PAID ON OTHER VESSELS BELONGING TO THE CIVIL BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT AND SALARIES PAID IN THE MERCHANT MARINE, AND SHOWING THAT REVENUE-CUTTER OFFICERS NOW RECEIVE FAR HIGHER SALARIES THAN ARE PAID FOR CORRESPONDING SERVICE IN THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Yearly or monthly pay.

Vessels.	Ton- nage.	Captain or master.	Lieutenants, officers, or mates.				Engineers and assistants.					
			First or chief.	Second.	Third.	Fourth.	Chief.	First.	Second.	Third.	Fourth.	Eighth.
<i>Revenue cutters.</i>												
Seminole, at Boston	588	\$2,500.00	\$1,800.00		\$1,200.00		\$1,800.00	\$1,500.00				
Chandler, Boston Harbor	95		1,800.00				1,800.00					
Calumet, at New York Harbor duty	123		1,800.00				1,800.00					
Windom, at Baltimore	398	2,500.00	1,800.00	\$1,500.00			1,800.00	\$1,500.00				
Morrill, at Milwaukee	288	2,500.00	1,800.00	\$1,500.00	1,200.00		1,800.00		\$1,200.00			
Rush, at Sitka, Alaska	300	2,500.00		\$1,500.00	\$1,200.00		1,800.00	1,500.00	1,200.00			
<i>United States transports.</i>												
Viking	141	165.00					90.00					
Crook	4,126	200.00	100.00	75.00								
Grant, troopship	5,658	3,000.00	1,500.00	900.00	780.00	\$720.00	2,100.00	1,320.00	1,080.00	\$960.00		
Atlantic coast transports		200.00	100.00	75.00	65.00	60.00	150.00	100.00	75.00	65.00		
<i>Coast Survey steamers.</i>												
Pathfinder, in Alaska	460		125.00	100.00	60		140.00					
McArthur, in Alaska	190		130.00				115.00					
<i>Marine Hospital.</i>												
Steamer Welch Gulf							90.00					
<i>Light-House Service.</i>												
Tug Reno	135	165.00	90.00				115.00	90.00				
Tender Geranium	356	150.00	80.00				80.00	75.00				
Tender Mayflower	572	150.00	80.00	50.00			80.00	75.00				
Tender Azalea	423	150.00	80.00	50.00			100.00	75.00				
Steamer America	1,052	200.00	100.00	70.00	50.00		125.00	80.00	65.00			
Tender Amaranth on lakes	743	150.00	80.00	50.00			90.00	65.00				
Atlantic coast light vessels generally		1,000.00	780.00				960.00	780.00				
<i>Merchant-marine steamers.</i>												
<i>American mail:</i>												
St. Louis	11,629		120.00	70.00	60.00	40.00	150.00	100.00	85.00	70.00	\$65.00	\$50.00
Mexico (New York to Habana)	5,567		85.00	60.00	45.00		150.00	90.00	75.00	60.00		
Admiral Sampson	2,104		70.00	40.00			125.00	90.00	70.00	55.00		
Oceanic (British)	17,274		97.20	63.18	53.46	38.88	170.10	87.48	82.62	72.90	63.18	48.68
Kaiser Wilhelm (German)	14,349		66.64	38.08	30.94	23.80	119.00	71.40	60.69	51.17	41.65	26.18

\*2 each.

Great Lakes steamers, yearly or monthly wages.

	Tonnage.	Captain or master.	Officers or mates.		Engineers.			Months per year.
			First.	Second.	Chief.	Second.	Third.	
Goodrich Transportation Co.:								
Columbus .....	1,511	\$1,500	\$90	\$70	\$1,500	\$90		3
Virginia .....	1,608	1,800	90	70	1,500	90		4
Chicago .....	746	150	65	45	125	90		4
Indiana .....	1,177	150	65	45	125	90		
Williams Transportation Line, 4 steamers (each) .....	700	115	65		114			8½
South Haven Line (say average is about) .....		1,200	800		1,200			
Manitou Steamship Co., steamship Manitou .....	3,000	2,000	100	75	1,500	100	\$75	5
Lake Michigan and Lake Shore Transportation Co., passenger steamship City of Traverse .....	1,153	165	85		125			7½
Average wages on British vessels in foreign trade of 2,000 tons or over in 1900 .....			57	40	89	62	47	
Average wages on German steamships in foreign trade in 1900 .....		82	47	31	82	49		



[From Report of Commissioner of Navigation.]

Average rates of monthly wages paid in the American merchant marine for fiscal year ended June 30, 1901.

Port.	Steam.							
	Able sea- men.	Boatswains.	Carpenters.	First mates.	Second mates.	Firemen.	First engi- neers.	Second en- gineers.
TO GREAT BRITAIN.								
From 500 to 1,500 tons.								
New York .....	\$25.00	\$30.00	\$40.00	\$60.00	\$45.00	\$30.00	\$115.00	\$70.00
Over 1,500 tons.								
New York .....	25.00	37.50	50.00	120.00	70.00	40.00	150.00	100.00
TO SOUTH AMERICA.								
From 500 to 1,500 tons.								
Norfolk .....	25.00	-----	30.00	60.00	45.00	30.00	100.00	70.00
Philadelphia .....	25.00	-----	-----	75.00	50.00	30.00	125.00	75.00
Over 1,500 tons.								
New York .....	25.00	30.00	40.00	80.00	60.00	40.00	125.00	75.00
Norfolk .....	25.00	-----	35.00	65.00	-----	35.00	110.00	75.00
TO WEST INDIES, MEXICO, AND CENTRAL AMERICA.								
From 500 to 1,500 tons.								
Baltimore .....	25.00	30.00	35.00	55.00	45.00	30.00	100.00	70.00
Boston .....	25.00	30.00	30.00	70.00	40.00	40.00	125.00	90.00
New York .....	25.00	30.00	35.00	65.00	45.00	35.00	115.00	75.00
Over 1,500 tons.								
Baltimore .....	30.00	35.00	35.00	60.00	45.00	35.00	115.00	70.00
Boston .....	25.00	30.00	35.00	70.00	40.00	40.00	125.00	90.00
New Orleans .....	30.00	35.00	60.00	75.00	50.00	50.00	125.00	75.00
New York .....	25.00	30.00	40.00	75.00	55.00	35.00	125.00	80.00
Norfolk .....	25.00	-----	-----	70.00	45.00	35.00	100.00	70.00
Philadelphia .....	25.38	30.17	31.03	69.53	40.81	34.89	122.19	86.41
ATLANTIC AND GULF COAST- ING TRADE.								
Under 500 tons.								
Baltimore .....	25.00	30.00	-----	75.00	45.00	35.00	110.00	75.00
Philadelphia .....	25.00	-----	30.00	65.41	-----	35.00	102.67	65.83
From 500 to 1,500 tons.								
Baltimore .....	25.00	30.00	-----	75.00	45.00	35.00	125.00	75.00
Boston .....	25.00	30.00	30.00	65.00	40.00	35.00	115.00	85.00
New Orleans .....	30.00	35.00	60.00	75.00	50.00	50.00	125.00	75.00
New York .....	25.00	30.00	35.00	65.00	45.00	35.00	115.00	75.00

Average monthly wages paid to first engineers on American steam vessels, 1894 to 1901.

Port.	1894.	1895.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.
<b>TO WEST INDIES, MEXICO, AND CENTRAL AMERICA.</b>							
<i>Over 1,500 tons.</i>							
Baltimore			\$100.00	\$100.00			\$115.00
Boston				110.00	\$125.00	\$125.00	125.00
New Orleans			125.00				125.00
New York	\$125.00	\$125.00		87.50	125.00	125.00	125.00
Norfolk							100.00
Philadelphia	125.00	125.00	110.00		125.00	125.00	122.19
San Francisco			100.00				150.00
<b>ATLANTIC AND GULF COASTING TRADE.</b>							
<i>From 500 to 1,500 tons.</i>							
Baltimore				115.00	90.00	110.00	125.00
Bath			85.00	75.00	100.00	100.00	
Boston				100.00	120.00	110.00	115.00
Mobile						100.00	
New Orleans	125.00	125.00		125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00
Newport News				120.00	90.15	100.00	54.96
New York				100.00	100.15	100.00	115.00
Pensacola				125.00	125.00	125.00	125.00
Philadelphia		90.00				125.00	
Portland							125.00
Providence		125.00			115.00	115.00	115.00
Waldoboro		125.00					
Wilmington	75.00						
<i>Over 1,500 tons.</i>							
Baltimore				115.00		110.00	125.00
Boston						110.00	125.00

Average monthly wages paid to first engineers, etc.—Continued.

Port.	1894.	1895.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.
<b>ATLANTIC AND GULF COASTING TRADE—continued.</b>							
<i>Over 1,500 tons.</i>							
New Orleans			\$125.00	\$125.00		\$125.00	\$125.00
New York	\$105.00	\$125.00		125.00	\$125.00	125.00	125.00
Norfolk		125.00	120.00	125.00			154.16
Philadelphia							
Providence					130.00		

Average monthly wages paid to first mates on American steamers, 1894 to 1901.

Port.	1894.	1895.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.
<b>TO WEST INDIES, MEXICO, AND CENTRAL AMERICA.</b>							
<i>Over 1,500 tons.</i>							
Baltimore			\$80.00	\$55.00			\$60.00
Bath							
Boston				70.00	\$60.00	\$70.00	70.00
New Orleans			75.00	75.00		75.00	75.00
New York	\$80.00	\$80.00		50.00	65.00	75.00	75.00
Norfolk							70.00
Philadelphia	75.00	75.00	65.00		60.00	70.00	69.53
Port Townsend							
Providence							
San Francisco			100.00				100.00
<b>ATLANTIC AND GULF COASTING TRADE.</b>							
<i>Over 1,500 tons.</i>							
Baltimore			65.00			70.00	75.00
Bath							
Boston						70.00	70.00
Mobile							
New Bedford							
New Orleans			75.00	75.00		75.00	75.00
Newport News							
New York	65.00	80.00		65.00	65.00	75.00	70.00
Norfolk							
Philadelphia		75.00	65.00	70.00			75.00
Portland							
Providence					75.00		

GOODRICH TRANSPORTATION COMPANY,  
SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE,  
Chicago, February 6, 1902.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of February 1 addressed to this company has been handed to me for attention, and I gladly attach hereto the information called for.

You will note that the captains and engineers of the steamship *Columbus* and steamship *Virginia* get a yearly salary, but the officers of the other boats do not draw pay during the winter lay-up season.Trusting that this fully covers what you desire, I am, yours, respectfully,  
D. M. COCHRANE, Superintendent.Mr. JAMES R. MANN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Salaries of officers.

Boat.	Gross tons.	Master.	Chief engineer.	Second engineer.	First officer.	Second officer.	In commission.
Columbus	1,511	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$90	\$90	\$70	3 months.
Virginia	1,006	\$1,800	\$1,500	90	90	70	4 months.
Indiana	1,177	150	125	90	65	45	8 months.
		125	125	90	60	40	4 months.
Racine	1,041	150	125	90	65	45	8 months.
		125	125	90	60	40	4 months.
Atlanta	1,129	150	125	90	65	45	8 months.
		125	125	90	60	40	4 months.
Iowa	1,157	150	125	90	65	45	8 months.
		125	125	90	60	45	4 months.
Georgia	895	150	125	90	60	40	4 months.
Chicago	746	150	125	90	65	45	4 months.
Sheboygan	623	150	125	90	65	45	4 months.
Total	9,885						

\* Yearly.

In connection with the above would state that the *Columbus* runs from the latter part of June to the first week in September and the steamship *Virginia* from the middle of June until the latter part of September or first of October. Steamers *Chicago* and *Sheboygan* run practically during the same time. In the winter time three of the other five boats run throughout.LAKE MICHIGAN AND LAKE SUPERIOR  
TRANSPORTATION COMPANY,  
Chicago, February 7, 1902.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 1st instant, the rate of wages paid by us to masters, mates, and engineers on our passenger steamers is as follows:

	Per month.
Masters	\$105
Mates	85
Engineers	125

The time they are employed is about seven and one-half months, which is the extent of our season of navigation. The engineers usually put in a little longer time than masters or mates, and their time would probably extend over eight months. It depends on the work there is to do in their department. The gross tonnage of our passenger steamers is as follows: Steamer *City of Traverse*, 1,153 tons; steamer *Peerless*, 1,199 tons. There are no wages paid during the lay-up season in winter except for ship keepers. Any other information required will be pleased to furnish.

Yours, truly,

C. F. A. SPENCER, Secretary.

THE H. W. WILLIAMS TRANSPORTATION LINE,  
South Haven, Mich., February 7, 1902.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours, 1st instant, below find information asked: Masters, \$115; mates, \$85; engineers, \$114 per month, during season navigation only, which commences about March 15 and closes about December 1; average gross tonnage our four steamers, 700 tons.

Yours, truly,

THE H. W. WILLIAMS TRANSPORTATION LINE,  
Per M. E. PEARMAN.

SOUTH HAVEN LINE STEAMERS, DUNKLEY COMPANY,  
Chicago, February 6, 1902.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your esteemed favor of the 1st instant, relative to scale of wages which we pay to the masters, mates, and engineers on our passenger steamers, would say:

We are a new line, just having opened up the business last year, hence appointed no annual men, with one exception. However, during our short season the chief engineer drew about \$1,000; the captain approximately the same. We had several changes in mates, which averaged \$55 per month for first mate; second mate, \$55 per month.

I understand the line men were mostly employed by the year this past season, and \$1,200 for the captains and chief engineers is a very fair estimate; the mates about \$800 per year.

We will be very glad to furnish you any information in our power at any time. We appreciate many of these subjects are for the good of the service.

Yours, very truly,

G. P. CORY,  
General Manager.

MANITOU STEAMSHIP COMPANY,  
GENERAL PASSENGER DEPARTMENT,  
Chicago, February 5, 1902.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor of the 1st instant I have the pleasure to state that this company owns and operates the steamship *Manitou*, 3,000 gross tonnage. This ship is an exclusively passenger carrier, and is therefore in commission only about three months in the year, and for that reason the wages which we pay to our employees may not be a proper criterion for the purposes for which you desire the information.

Our captain receives a salary of \$2,000 for the season, but we have his services for the entire year in case we require it. The same holds good as to our chief engineer, who receives a salary of \$1,500. Our second engineer receives \$100 per month and the third \$75 per month. Our first mate receives \$100 per month and the second mate \$75 per month, but it must be borne in mind that the four latter officers are probably employed from four to five months during the year, as it will take the additional time over the actual running season to fit out and lay up the ship.

Trusting that this information may be of some service to you, I am,

Very truly, yours,

JOS. BEROLZHEIM,  
General Passenger Agent.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION OF FISH AND FISHERIES,  
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1902.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your inquiry of February 3, I have the honor to say that the vessels of this Commission, with the exception of a sea-going schooner and several launches, are officered and manned by the Navy. The master of the schooner receives \$1,500 per annum, the first mate \$1,000, and the second mate \$840. The launches are not specially provided with crews, but when used are placed in charge of other employees competent to operate them. There are several machinists appropriated for in the Commission who are competent to act as engineers of the small vessels, whose pay is \$900 per annum.

Very respectfully,

GEO. M. BOWERS, Commissioner.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY,  
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1902.

Hon. J. R. MANN,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: In response to your request of the 3d instant, I give below a list of the officers attached to the vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. All officers on these vessels are either surveyors or under instructions as surveyors, and all take an active part in the navigation and management of the vessels; consequently the service makes no such classification as is indicated in your note, the officers being indiscriminately assigned to the deck, to boat and landing parties to meet the varying conditions, the existence of certain designations which are more purely nautical than others being simply the result of the form in which the appropriation is made.

1 commanding officer, at \$2,400 per annum	\$2,400
2 commanding officers, at \$2,200 per annum	4,400
4 commanding officers, at \$1,600 per annum	6,400
3 commanding officers, at \$1,200 per annum	3,600
1 navigating officer, at \$1,400 per annum	1,400
1 assistant navigating officer, at \$1,200 per annum	1,200
2 assistant navigating officers, at \$720 per annum	1,440

1 assistant navigating officer, at \$900 per annum	\$900
1 watch officer, at \$150 per month	1,800
4 watch officers, at \$135 per month	6,480
2 watch officers, at \$130 per month	3,120
3 watch officers, at \$125 per month	4,500
2 watch officers, at \$120 per month	2,880
2 watch officers, at \$115 per month	2,700
1 watch officer, at \$110 per month	1,320
1 chief engineer, at \$140 per month	1,680
2 chief engineers, at \$130 per month	3,120
4 chief engineers, at \$115 per month	5,520
9 deck officers, at \$100 per month	10,800
1 deck officer, at \$80 per month	720
5 surgeons, at \$125 per month	7,500
2 assistant surgeons, at \$110 per month	2,640
2 captains' clerks, at \$110 per month	2,640
2 captains' clerks, at \$75 per month	1,800

Respectfully,

O. H. TITTMANN, Superintendent.

#### PAY OF REVENUE-CUTTER OFFICERS ON GREAT LAKES.

The present statute fixing the pay of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service provides for a substantial reduction of the pay while the officers are on leave of absence or while waiting orders.

The Revenue-Cutter Service calculates the Revenue-Cutter vessels on the Great Lakes as in commission eight months in the year. (See Appendix S, last Book of Estimates.)

The cutter *Morrill*, for instance, has 7 commissioned officers. She is stationed at Milwaukee, Wis. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, she traveled a total distance of 9,092 miles and was steaming a total of thirty-six days twelve hours and forty minutes for the entire year. During the months of January, February, and March, 1901, she did not travel a mile nor have steam up. During the months of December, 1900, and April, 1901, together, she was under steam less than a total of four days. Her seamen were discharged, her officers had nothing to do, but they continued to draw full pay.

Statement showing tonnage, number of officers and men, and monthly salaries paid on various vessels.

Vessel.	Gross tonnage.	Number of officers and men employed.	Total monthly pay.
Revenue-cutter Windom	398	44	\$1,975
Revenue-cutter Rush	300	41	2,227
Revenue-cutter Morrill	288	43	1,916
Revenue-cutter Seminole	588	56	2,205
Revenue-cutter Calumet	123	12	800
Revenue-cutter Chandler	95	12	795
Mail steamer Mexico, New York to Habana	5,567	92	2,940
Mail steamer Admiral Sampson	2,104	51	1,825
American steamer St. Louis	11,629	380	11,806
German steamer Kaiser Wilhelm	14,349	500	7,715
British steamer Oceanic	17,274	427	9,881

#### CALUMET.

[123 tons.]

Crew.	Rate of pay.	Total pay.
1 pilot	\$100	\$100
4 seamen, each	45	180
3 firemen, each	50	150
1 wardroom steward	35	35
1 cook	35	35
10		500

Per month.

10 men's pay	\$500
2 officers' pay	300
12	800

#### CHANDLER.

[95 tons.]

Crew.	Rate of pay.	Total pay.
1 pilot	\$100	\$100
1 boatswain	45	45
4 seamen, each	45	180
2 firemen, each	50	100
1 wardroom steward	35	35
1 cook	35	35
10		495

Per month.

10 men's pay	\$495
2 officers' pay	300
12	795



Statement showing tonnage, number of officers and men, etc.—Continued.

## SEMINOLE.

[Gross tonnage, 588.]

Crew.	Rate of pay.	Total pay.
1 boatswain	\$50	\$50
1 gunner	45	45
1 carpenter	45	45
1 chief oiler	50	50
1 master-at-arms	40	40
1 second oiler	40	40
3 quartermasters, each	30	90
2 cockswains, each	28	56
1 third oiler	40	40
12 seamen, each	25	300
6 firemen, each	30	180
6 ordinary seamen, each	20	120
1 bugler	20	20
3 coal heavers, each	25	75
1 cabin steward	35	35
1 wardroom steward	35	35
1 cook	30	30
4 first-class boys, each	15	60
8 second-class boys, each	12	96
50		1,947
Per month.		
50 men's salaries		\$1,947
6 officers' salaries		858
56		2,805

## MORRILL.

[Gross tonnage, 288.]

Crew.	Rate of pay.	Total pay.
1 boatswain	\$45	\$45
1 gunner	40	40
1 carpenter	40	40
1 master-at-arms	35	35
1 second oiler	37	37
2 quartermasters, each	30	60
4 cockswains, each	28	112
1 third oiler	35	35
7 seamen	25	175
2 firemen, each	30	60
4 ordinary seamen, each	20	80
1 bugler	20	20
2 coal heavers, each	25	50
1 cabin steward	35	35
1 wardroom steward	35	35
1 cook	30	30
3 first-class boys, each	15	45
2 second-class boys, each	12	24
36		958
Per month.		
36 men's salaries		\$958.00
7 officers' salaries		958.33
43		1,916.33

## RUSH.

[Gross tonnage, 300.]

Crew.	Rate of pay.	Total pay.
1 boatswain	\$60	\$60
1 gunner	55	55
1 carpenter	55	55
1 master-at-arms	45	45
1 second oiler	45	45
2 quartermasters, each	40	80
2 cockswains, each	37	74
1 third oiler	45	45
4 seamen, each	35	140
2 firemen, each	45	90
6 ordinary seamen, each	30	180
1 bugler	25	25
2 coal heavers, each	35	70
2 stewards, each	45	90
1 cook	40	40
5 first-class boys, each	20	100
33		1,194
Per month.		
33 men's salaries		\$1,194
6 officers' salaries		1,033
41		2,227

Statement showing tonnage, number of officers and men, etc.—Continued.

## WINDOM.

[Gross tonnage, 398.]

Crew.	Rate of pay.	Total pay.
1 pilot	\$75	\$75
1 boatswain	50	50
1 gunner	45	45
1 carpenter	45	45
1 chief oiler	50	50
1 master-at-arms	35	35
1 second oiler	37	37
2 quartermasters, each	30	60
2 cockswains, each	28	56
6 seamen, each	25	150
4 firemen, each	30	120
4 ordinary seamen, each	20	80
1 bugler	20	20
4 coal heavers, each	25	100
1 cabin steward	35	35
1 wardroom steward	35	35
1 cook	30	30
3 first-class boys, each	15	45
2 second-class boys, each	12	24
38		1,092
Per month.		
38 men's salaries		\$1,092
6 officers' salaries		883
44		1,975

WASHINGTON, February 25, 1902.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge your two communications of the 24th instant.

In reply to one, I beg to say that I have no accurate information as to the performance of duty analogous to that executed by the Revenue-Cutter Service in this country in England, France, and Germany. I believe, however, that the duty is performed in England and France by what is known there as the "coast guards," and that the officers of the vessels of that service are taken from the reserve lists of their navies.

I will be glad to serve you further if you will make your wishes known.

Very truly, yours,

C. F. SHOEMAKER,  
Captain, Revenue-Cutter Service, Chief of Division.

## REVENUE SERVICE AND COAST GUARD IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

## England.

In England the revenue service and coast guard are under the direct control of the Admiralty, and have been since 1856. The men are all picked men from the regular service. The coast-guard ships proper are all old battle ships and ironclads, and are officered by regular naval officers. The coast is divided into districts, and each district has a naval officer as an inspector. There are gunboats for patrolling attached to each district, and these also are officered by naval officers either on the active or retired list.

In addition to the ships there are coast-guard stations all around the coast, and the entire coast is patrolled day and night. The coast guard not only are a preventive to smuggling, but they are so closely allied to the life-saving service that the two are practically one. Lifeboats' crews always have some coast-guard men in them, and frequently are manned entirely by the coast guard.

The service being entirely under the Admiralty, the pay of officers is the same as in the Regular Navy.

## France.

The French Government has no service which corresponds directly to our revenue marine. The duties which we confide to that branch of the Government service are performed partly by the customs authorities and partly by the navy.

The customs service more nearly corresponds to our revenue marine than anything else. The central administration of the customs is confided, under the ministry of finance, to a director-general, who is the sole medium of communication between the service and the minister.

The following is the strength of the force for the whole frontier:

Directors	26
Inspectors	79
Subinspectors	2
Captains	230
Lieutenants	249
Men of various ratings	19,511

The directors are divided into four classes, and receive 12,000, 10,000, 9,000, and 8,000 francs a year. They have also allowances for quarters and office expenses.

The inspectors are divided into three classes, and receive 6,000, 5,000, and 4,500 francs a year.

Subinspectors receive 3,500 and 3,000 francs a year.

Captains are divided into three classes, and receive 3,300, 2,800, and 2,400 francs a year.

Lieutenants are divided into three classes, and receive 2,300, 2,000, and 1,800 francs a year.

The other grades receive from 1,300 to 900 francs a year.

Captains and lieutenants receive an allowance for quarters of 400 and 200 francs a year, respectively.

The revenue boats are usually under the direct charge of the captains. The employment of parties afloat in boats or vessels outside of the ports is so unusual that very little provision is made for that contingency.

The duties which we are accustomed to associate with the idea of a revenue marine, namely, the repression of contraband trade, are performed by the customs authorities working on shore, while the duties actually performed by our revenue marine, namely, the policing of waters adjacent to the coast, are in France the peculiar and especial duty of the navy.

## Germany.

There is no armed revenue marine in Germany. There are a number of very small vessels employed for putting customs officers on board shipping, but there is no military force acting in connection with the customs officers or treasury.

## VESSELS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

The register of July 1, 1901, gives the number of vessels, launches, etc., of all classes in the service as 41. Of these 1 is a receiving ship, 1 a practice ship, 1 a sloop connected with the Life-Saving Service; 14 are assigned to mere harbor or anchorage duty in various harbors; 6 are on duty in Alaskan or Arctic waters; 2 are on the Great Lakes.

The largest revenue cutter is the *McCulloch*, which has a gross tonnage of 869 tons. Of the 42 vessels, only 8 have a gross tonnage of more than 500 tons. Only 11 have a draft of 10 feet or more.

In the annual report of the Revenue-Cutter Service for 1897 the following vessels, still in the service, were then reported as practically worthless, to wit: *McLane*, *Boutwell*, *Washington*, *Chandler*, *Forward*, *Winona*, *Galveston*. These vessels are now on duty as follows: *Chandler*, on harbor duty at Boston; *Washington*, on harbor duty at Philadelphia; *Boutwell*, on duty at Newbern, N. C.; *Forward*, at Charleston, S. C.; *McLane*, at Key West; *Winona*, at Mobile; *Galveston*, at Galveston.

In the report of 1897 the chief of the Service stated, referring to the 27 vessels in the service in 1895, that "There are but two of these vessels (the cruisers *Boutwell* and *Galveston*) of over 400 tons burden \* \* \* and not a single one has motive power to drive it, under the most favorable conditions of weather and sea, at top speed more than 10 or 11 knots an hour, while the average speed of the best of them will not exceed 8 or 9."

In the last annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury (p. 55) the Secretary states that "Attention is again invited to the absolute necessity for providing a number of new vessels to replace old ones of the fleet. The old, obsolete, and in other respects inefficient vessels in the Revenue-Cutter Service are a source of constant anxiety, not only because they are not adapted to the work of the Service and can not be depended upon in emergencies," etc. "These vessels are anything rather than efficient revenue cutters; they are discreditable to the Department, and furnish subject for criticism. Of this class are the following:"

The *Woodbury* (now at Portland Me.); the *McLane* (now at Key West); the *Hamilton* (now at Savannah, Ga.); the *Boutwell* (now at Newbern, N. C.). "It is plain that further expenditures on these old vessels should not be continued longer than it will take to provide new ones to supply their places. It is therefore recommended that new vessels be constructed to replace those above named at a cost for each of \$175,000. This will require an appropriation of \$700,000."

There is no vessel in the Revenue-Cutter Service of 1,000 tons burden.

The Light-House Board has 36 steam tenders, 11 steam launches, and 2 sailing tenders.

The new steam tenders of the Light-House Board cost over \$100,000 each, and a new one has been authorized for the Pacific coast to cost \$120,000 (Thirteenth district).

In the Second light-house district (Boston) there are 4 steam tenders including the *Mayflower*, a steel screw steamer of 572 tons' gross burden built in 1897.

Under the Hepburn bill, on July 1, 1902, seven captains would be retired on account of age. On the 1st day of July, 1907, there would have been retired 31 captains on account of age by reason of retirement for age only. There would be promoted several persons as captain by July 1, 1907, who had been commissioned in the service at that time less than twenty years and one of whom would be only 40 years of age.

Through retirement only there would be promoted by July 1, 1907, to first lieutenant several persons of the age of only 32 years and one of whom would have been commissioned in the service only nine years.

By retirement only on July 1, 1902, there would be promoted to first lieutenant several persons who would then be commissioned in the service only eleven years.

As illustrating the age and length of service of the engineers, I submit one of the present chief engineers is only 37 years of age May 3, 1902, and only entered the service February 18, 1888. Not any of the first assistant engineers entered the service prior to May 12, 1888, and three only entered the service in July, 1895.

Of the second assistant engineers, not any entered the service prior to July 13, 1895, and several entered the service in February, 1901.

There is to-day 1 retired officer, Captain Hodgson, who commanded the *McCulloch* at the battle of Manila Bay.

On the permanent waiting-orders list there are 4 captains, 4 first lieutenants, 1 second lieutenant, 1 third lieutenant, 9 chief engineers, 6 first assistant engineers, 3 second assistant engineers. These were all placed on the permanent waiting-orders list in 1895, shortly following the passage of the act approved March 2, 1895, authorizing such action.

BUREAU OF PENSIONS,  
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1901.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: In compliance with your personal request of yesterday for the number of claims filed on account of disability and death resulting from service on the revenue cutters during the war with Spain, you are furnished the following statement:

Claims for invalid pension by enlisted men	8
Claims for invalid pension by commissioned officers	0
Claims on account of death of enlisted men	2
Claims on account of death of commissioned officers	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>

None of the claims for invalid pension has been allowed. One has been rejected for the reason that the disability existed prior to enlistment. The others are in process of adjudication.

The two claims on account of death of enlisted men are pending, awaiting the claimants' response to calls for evidence. One of the claims on account of death of a commissioned officer, of a dependent mother, was rejected—the officer having left a child who had prior right and who was pensioned; but pension was subsequently allowed the mother by special act of Congress. The other two were allowed under the general law.

Very respectfully,

H. CLAY EVANS, Commissioner.

BUREAU OF PENSIONS,  
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1902.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 24th ultimo, in which you request that the information furnished you February 1, 1901, in regard to claims filed on account of disability and death resulting from service on the revenue cutters during the war with Spain, be brought to date, you are advised that no claims of this class have been filed since the former report was made to you. The following statement shows the present condition of the claims on file at that time:

## Claims for invalid pension:

Pending	3
Admitted	1
Rejected	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>

## Widows and dependents:

Pending	1
Admitted	4
Rejected	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>

Very respectfully,

H. CLAY EVANS, Commissioner.

## MEMORANDUM SHOWING THAT THE WORK OF THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE HAS NOT INCREASED IN RECENT YEARS.

For fiscal year 1873 this service boarded 30,543 vessels.  
For fiscal year 1878 this service boarded 31,066 vessels.  
For fiscal year 1879 this service boarded 32,853 vessels.  
For fiscal year 1880 this service boarded 36,318 vessels.  
For fiscal year 1889 this service boarded 18,039 vessels.  
For fiscal year 1900 this service boarded 20,089 vessels.  
For fiscal year 1901 this service boarded 22,563 vessels.

## VESSELS IN DISTRESS ASSISTED.

In the report submitted by Mr. SHERMAN for the committee favoring this bill it is stated that during the fiscal year of 1901 the number of "vessels in distress assisted" by the Revenue-Cutter Service was 107, and that the "value of vessels assisted and their cargoes" was \$5,197,825, and that the number of "persons on board vessels assisted" was 1,581.

Great stress is laid in the committee report upon this showing, and the plain intention is to give the impression that the vessels of the Revenue-Cutter Service, through its arduous and gallant actions, saved from destruction a large number of lives and a large amount of property. The intimation is that the "vessels in distress" were in danger of shipwreck in time of storm, or something of that sort, and that through the bravery of the Revenue-Cutter officers these "vessels in distress" were rescued.

Herewith is submitted statements taken from the records of the Revenue-Cutter Service office in all cases of assistance rendered to "vessels in distress" during the fiscal year of 1901 where the value of the vessel and cargo together equaled \$75,000. The cases set forth cover the amount of \$4,441,345 out of the total of \$5,197,825 which the Revenue-Cutter Service claims to have assisted during the year.

An examination of these reports shows that in no case was any danger incurred by the Revenue-Cutter Service officers or vessels; that in no case was assistance rendered in time of storm or danger, and in no case was any very substantial assistance rendered at all. One instance of assistance rendered to a boat of the Navy is also given as an example:

Statement showing all cases where assistance to "vessels in distress" was rendered by revenue cutters during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, wherein the value of the vessel assisted, together with its cargo, amounted to the sum of \$75,000.

Revenue cutter.	Date.	Vessels assisted.	Value of vessel assisted and cargo.
McCulloch	July 11, 1900	Nome City	\$150,000
Rush	July 17, 1900	Jabez Howes	105,000
Do	Aug. 21, 1900	Rufus E. Wood	98,000
Bear	Oct. 2, 1900	Robert Dollar	95,000
Onondaga	Dec. 15, 1900	I. F. Chapman	155,000
Windom	Jan. 13, 1901	Inch Keith	302,000
Gresham	Feb. 6, 1901	Astral	285,000
McLane	Mar. 14, 1901	Margaret	85,800
Golden Gate	June 4, 1901	Cardiganshire	90,545
Nunivak	June 22, 1901	Leon	2,600,000
Do	June 25, 1901	Louise	75,000
Algonquin	June 29, 1901	Star Cross	400,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>4,441,345</b>



TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, February 15, 1902.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 13th instant, asking to be furnished with the data on which the summary of the work performed by vessels of the Revenue-Cutter Service during the past fiscal year, as it appears in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, was based, I have respectfully to state that the records from which it was compiled are voluminous and cannot be conveniently copied. In accordance with your suggestion an opportunity will be afforded you at any time to make a personal examination of said data.

Respectfully,

O. L. SPAULDING,  
Assistant Secretary.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, March 7, 1902.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: Agreeably to your letter of the 5th instant, I inclose copies of the statements therein requested, which are given in the order in which they occur in your letter.

The estimated value of the cargo (\$2,500,000) of the steamer *Leon* was inadvertently omitted in making up the tabular statement for the annual report. It has, however, been included in the statements prepared since the report was submitted, as it is in the one inclosed.

Assistance rendered to Government vessels is not usually included in our tabular statements. The launch of the U. S. S. *Michigan*, however, was included because her position was regarded as one of peril.

Respectfully,

C. F. SHOEMAKER,  
Captain, Revenue-Cutter Service, Chief of Division.

Vessel assisting, *Fessenden*.  
Vessel assisted, steam launch, U. S. S. *Michigan*.  
Date, July 4, 1900.  
Number of persons on board, 7.  
Value of vessel (no cargo), \$2,500.  
Nature of casualty, engine broke down.  
Location, Detroit, Mich.

Detailed report: The vessel being anchored off the foot of Bates street, Detroit, Mich., about 9:30 p. m., on July 4, 1900, was hailed by the steam launch of the U. S. S. *Michigan*, requesting assistance, as she was drifting downstream into the path of the ferry and excursion boats, with her engine disabled. Sent the dingy to her assistance and towed her upstream to the *Michigan*, which was anchored above us.

Vessel assisting, *McCulloch*.  
Vessel assisted, steamer *Nome City*, 1,660 tons.  
Date, July 11, 1900.  
Number of persons on board, 60.  
Value of vessel, \$150,000.  
Nature of casualty, lost three blades of her propeller.  
Location, 255 miles W. & N. of Cape Flattery.  
State of weather, clear and pleasant.  
Direction and force of wind, light west breeze.  
State of tide and sea, smooth sea, gentle southerly swell.

Detailed report: July 11, 1900, at 4.15 p. m., en route Dutch Harbor to Seattle, 270 W. & N. of Cape Flattery, sighted the steam schooner *Nome City* standing across bow of this vessel making little headway, although under steam and sail with a fair wind. At 6.15 p. m., when she was abreast, a signal was hoisted which we could not read. Standing toward the *Nome City*, her master stated he had lost three blades of his propeller July 4; was bound for Portland, Oreg., and asked to be towed to Astoria. The commanding officer of the *McCulloch* offered to tow him to Port Townsend; steam was ordered on all boilers in order to get in with the disabled vessel before bad weather set in. The *Nome City* sent an 8-inch hawser by one of her boats, and at 7.10 p. m. took her in tow. At 8 a. m., July 13, cast her off at Port Townsend, having towed her 340 miles in thirty-seven hours.

Vessel assisting, *Rush*.  
Vessel assisted, ship *Jabez Howes*, 1,648 tons.  
Date, July 17, 1900.  
Number of persons on board, 17.  
Value of vessel with cargo, \$105,000.  
Nature of casualty, coal given out.  
Location, Dutch Harbor, Alaska.

Detailed report: At the request of the master of the ship *Jabez Howes* and the agent of the North American Commercial Company, steamed alongside that ship and towed her alongside wharf to discharge her cargo. The coal had given out at the company's station, and this was the only coal in Dutch Harbor, and there were no other means at hand to put her alongside wharf.

Vessel assisting, *Gresham*.  
Vessel assisted, barkentine *White Wings*.  
Date, August 19, 1900.  
Number of persons on board, 8.  
Value of vessel, with cargo, \$73,000.  
Nature of casualty: Sea smooth; in trying to sail from anchorage carried down by tide.

Location: Off Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y.  
Detailed report: At 6.30 a. m., observing that the barkentine *White Wings* in sailing from anchorage toward channel was carried across the bow of the ship *Claverdon*, we got under way and proceeded to her assistance. The tug *Unity* of New York arriving and making a bargain, ran her hawsers and tried to pull her clear. Being unable to do so owing to the strong tide, she requested our assistance. We gave her our 11-inch hawser and held the *Unity* in position and also helped her tow. The tug had the *White Wings* on a bridle, and just as she was going clear the forward leg of bridle parted, the *White Wings* slewed, her mizzenmast fetched up against the bowsprit of the *Claverdon*, and threatened to carry it away at the deck. Some running gear was parted, also the forward swifter and one stay. The next attempt she came clear and proceeded to sea.

Vessel assisting, *Rush*.  
Vessel assisted, bark *Rufus E. Wood*, 1,477 tons.  
Date, August 21, 1900.  
Number of persons on board, 17.  
Value of vessel with cargo, \$98,000.  
Nature of casualty, mutiny.  
Location, Unalaska, Alaska.

Detailed report: Sent two officers and three armed men to arrest a mutinous sailor who had threatened the master and who had deserted from the

*Rufus E. Wood*. Apprehended him, placed him in irons, and delivered him to the master of the *Wood*.

Vessel assisting, *Bear*.  
Vessel assisted, *Robert Dollar*, 1,389 tons.  
Date, October 2, 1900.  
Number of persons on board, 88.  
Value of vessel with cargo, \$95,000.  
Nature of casualty, run aground.  
Location, off Nome, Alaska.  
State of weather, overcast and drizzling rain.  
Direction and force of wind, ESE. to to NE.; force, 3 to 5.  
State of tide and sea, flood tide, choppy sea.

Detailed report: At 8 a. m., October 2, a steam launch came alongside and reported American steamer *Robert Dollar*, of San Francisco, aground and that the master requested assistance. The *Bear* was immediately got under way and anchored as near the *Dollar* as safety permitted. The *Robert Dollar*, having a steam launch, ran a hawser, binding three hawsers together to reach the *Bear*, the latter at the time being anchored in 4 fathoms of water. At 10.15 got under way and steamed ahead at full speed; started the *Dollar*, but carried away tow line. Stood back for anchorage and ran line to *Dollar*. At 1.30 made second attempt to haul vessel off, when line again parted. *Dollar* sent line and, using *Bear* as an anchor, hove herself off, floating at 7.45 p. m. During the day the wind increased from gentle easterly to fresh north-easterly breezes, and sea was making rapidly when the *Dollar* was floated.

Vessel assisting, *Onondaga*.  
Vessel assisted, ship *I. F. Chapin*, 2,013 tons.  
Date, December 15, 16, and 17, 1900.  
Number of persons on board, 28.  
Value of vessel with cargo, \$155,000.  
Nature of casualty, ashore.  
Location, off North Jetty, Christiana Creek, Wilmington, Del.  
State of weather, clear and cold.  
Direction and force of wind, NE. 2.  
State of tide and sea, smooth sea, half flood.

Detailed report: At 5 p. m. December 15 came up with ship *I. F. Chapin* aground inside black buoy at southerly entrance to Cherry Island Channel off North Jetty; Christiana Creek, Wilmington, Del., she having grounded in attempting to pass out of the channel in tow of tugs *O. L. Hallenbeck* and *Juno*. The ocean tug *Navigator* had parted 9-inch hawser the day before in attempting to haul her afloat and had given up the attempt. 5.15 anchored ahead of ship; 6.30, at request of master, took hold of his 9-inch line. Started vessel, but line parted.

Tide having fallen, gave up attempt for that tide and anchored for the night. At 6.30 a. m. of the 16th took hold of *Chapin's* 11-inch line. By 9 had hauled him onto ranges, but tide having fallen, anchored to wait next tide. No work done, at request of master of ship, that evening tide. At 7 a. m. of 17th took hold of 11-inch line, hauled him off west bank, but he grounded on east bank; 8 had to let go hawser to straighten our vessel down river, and in attempting to bring it again tug *Juno* fouled it in her wheel. Tide was lost for that morning. 9.30 anchored. At 9.15, after master had sent word that no attempt to float the vessel would be made on that night tide, the *Chapin* floated off by the efforts of her two tugs alone and without further assistance from this vessel.

Vessel assisting, *Windom*.  
Vessel assisted, steamship *Inch Keith*, 2,419 tons.  
Date, January 13, 1901.  
Number of persons on board, 39.  
Value of vessel with cargo, \$32,000.  
Nature of casualty, ashore.  
Location, Holland Point, Md.  
State of weather, clear.  
Direction and force of wind, NW; force, 3.  
State of tide and sea, three-quarter flood, sea smooth.

Detailed report: At 9.55 sighted a steamer ashore off Holland Point, Md.; stood for her; 10.30, stopped and boarded her, and found her to be the British steamer *Inch Keith*, of Liverpool; had gotten ashore at 7 p. m., 9th instant, and was lightering cargo. Tug *Sandow* ran our line to steamer and held us up and assisted while pulling on her; 11.40, steamer floated, apparently without damage. Both master and agents expressed greatest appreciation of services rendered.

Vessel assisting, *Gresham*.  
Vessel assisted, ship *Astral*, 2,995 tons.  
Date, February 6, 7, 8, and 9, 1901.  
Number of persons on board, 32.  
Value of vessels with cargo, \$235,000.  
Nature of casualty, mutiny.  
Location, off Sandy Hook light-ship.

Detailed report: On the 6th instant, while standing down through the Swash Channel to sea on a cruise, sighted Standard Oil Company's ship *Astral* at anchor, 2 miles N. by E. of Sandy Hook light-ship, both anchors down, sails roughly furled, and yards cockbilled. Stood for her and at 3.10 hailed the master and ascertained that his crew had refused to work. A 50-mile gale blowing, with high-running sea, and the crew not violent, it was deemed not safe to lower a boat, and boarding her was therefore postponed until the gale abated.

At 6 the following morning weighed anchor and stood out for the *Astral*. At 8.15 anchored off her starboard quarter. Although the wind was still blowing strong from the northwest and a high sea running, the whaleboat with an armed crew was lowered and sent to the *Astral*, and after a hard pull to windward reached the ship. The mutinous crew was mustered and the law relating to mutiny read to them. After consulting among themselves they were again mustered and each man was asked what he decided to do.

Eleven of the number returned to duty, two desired medical attention, and nine refused to go in the ship. Three ringleaders were put in single irons and brought aboard the cutter upon the request of the master, where they were held until the civil authorities could take measures for their incarceration.

On the 8th instant the place made vacant by the removal of the three ringleaders was filled by new men and as the remaining men who had held out on the 7th instant turned to, the ship with her proper complement was able to sail on her voyage. For the suppression of this mutiny the master of the ship and the representative of the Standard Oil Company were very grateful and expressed their appreciation of the assistance rendered by the *Gresham*. On the 9th instant at 3.30 p. m. two deputy United States marshals came on board the *Gresham* with a warrant for the arrest of the three men, and they were thereupon surrendered and taken to jail.

Vessel assisting, *McLane*.  
Vessel assisted, steamer *Margaret*, 674 tons.  
Date, March 14, 1901.  
Number of persons on board, 17.  
Value of vessel with cargo, \$85,800.  
Nature of casualty, run aground owing to dense fog.  
Location, Point Pinelos, Tampa Bay, Florida.

State of weather, overcast and raining.  
Direction and force of wind, calm.  
State of tide and sea, flood, smooth.

Detailed report: The steamer *Margaret* left Port Tampa, Fla., on the morning of March 13, 1901, with 150 excursionists, bound for Egmont Key, Florida. About 9 p. m., in a dense fog, the *Margaret* ran aground in an almost inaccessible place on Point Pinelos. On learning of accident, *McLane* got under way and steamed from St. Petersburg to within a mile of the *Margaret*. All passengers had been transferred from the *Margaret* to *Caloosa*, which ran aground while trying to assist. The tug *Catherine* could not reach her because of shoal water, and the *Margaret* would have been uncomfortably situated had it not been for the *McLane*. The latter sent out a boat to sound ahead, and by extremely careful work got within 200 yards of the *Margaret* and sent a 4-inch line on board. This line proved inadequate, and a 6-inch line was substituted. It was very difficult to maneuver on account of shoal water all around, but the *McLane* succeeded in floating the *Margaret* after three hours' work.

Vessel assisting, *Golden Gate*.

Vessel assisted, British ship *Cardiganshire*, 1,400 tons.

Date, June 4, 1901.

Number of persons on board, 23.

Value of vessel with cargo, \$90,545.

Nature of casualty, loss of anchor, etc., so that she was drifting helplessly on an island.

Location, San Francisco Harbor, California.

Detailed report: The British ship *Cardiganshire* coming into harbor under sail with licensed pilot aboard was taking in sail preparatory to rounding to, when the starboard anchor was let go, the chain snapped, and the port chain got fouled so as to be useless.

Ship was rapidly drifting on weather side of Alcatraz Island, a strong flood tide of about 6 knots running, and a fresh breeze from southwest. Seeing her helpless condition, *Golden Gate* steamed out to her, ran under her bow and got a line to her. She was not 50 feet from the rocks when the *Golden Gate* started ahead, and, with a strong flood tide, it looked as if she must go ashore, but in a few minutes she was started ahead, and after she was clear of the rocks about half a mile out our line carried away. Came alongside and made fast to her starboard quarter; brought her to anchor, the people on board having succeeded in clearing the port chain. The quarantine boat *Sternberg* was alongside, but was unable to do anything with her, owing to her lack of power, and both vessels were drifting on the rocks when the *Golden Gate* took hold of her. If the latter vessel had not taken hold of her so promptly there is no doubt she would have gone on the rocks, stove a hole in her, and probably lost the ship.

Detailed statements of the casualty and the nature and extent of service rendered by vessels of the Revenue-Cutter Service in the following instances:

Vessel assisting, *Nunivak*.

Vessel assisted, steamer *Leon*, 632 tons.

Date, June 22, 1901.

Number of persons on board, 205.

Value of vessel, with cargo, \$2,600,000.

Nature of casualty, out of provisions.

Location, mouth of Yukon River, Alaska.

Detailed report: Arriving at Aphoon, mouth of Yukon River, June 22, 1901, found steamer *Leon* short of provisions for passengers and crew, she having been detained here a week by ice and her supplies exhausted. No prospect of ice clearing up for several days. None of the other vessels could assist her, as they, too, were running short, and no supplies within reach on the river. Loaned her from ship's rations 800 pounds flour, 50 pounds coffee, 72 pounds butter, to be replaced in kind at St. Michael.

Vessel assisting, *Nunivak*.

Vessel assisted, steamer *Louise*.

Date, June 25, 1901.

Number of persons on board, 48.

Value of vessel, \$75,000.

Nature of casualty, delay on account of ice.

Location, Aphoon, mouth Yukon River, Alaska.

Detailed report: On June 25, 1901, while waiting for ice to clear at Aphoon, mouth Yukon River, Alaska, master of steamer *Louise* came on board and stated that his supplies were almost exhausted by the long delay. None being obtainable elsewhere, loaned him from ship's rations 200 pounds flour, to be replaced in St. Michael, this being all that the cutter could then safely spare.

Vessel assisting, *Algonquin*.

Vessel assisted, British steamer *Starcross*, 1,822 tons.

Date, June 29 and 30, 1901.

Number of persons on board, 24.

Estimated value of vessel with cargo, \$400,000.

Nature of casualty, run aground.

Location, Cape Lookout, North Carolina.

Detailed report: At 10.45 p. m., June 28, *Algonquin* at anchor off Southport. Information brought alongside by tug that a steamer was ashore on Lookout Shoal. At 11.45 officers and crew on liberty having been recalled, ship was under way and steaming out of harbor under three boilers and fires started under fourth. All possible speed made. At 9 a. m., 29th, arrived on scene, but as steamer was ashore well up on shoal great care had to be used in approaching her and the way sounded in.

It was 10 a. m. before we were close enough to send an officer in a boat to sound out around her and board her. Found she was the British steamship *Starcross*, of Cardiff, Milburn, master, from Brunswick, Ga., for Bremen via Newport News, with heavy laden cargo of cotton, phosphate, and lumber. She had taken ground on outer shoal at 5 p. m., 27th, weather being clear and bright, daylight, sea smooth. Soundings taken by us showed she was drawing 22 feet 2 inches and was ashore on 20-foot lump. The boarding officer's questions could not develop any reason for her going ashore. Light-house in plain sight, sea smooth, soundings increase gradually to southward of shoal. It seemed a miracle that she had been two days on shoal and no sea had rolled in and no wind had developed.

Before our arrival the master had floated her (so he said) with his engine, but through ignorance of locality, had again grounded at top of high water. Low water when we arrived, so nothing could be done in way of pulling. Thorough examination of soundings made, however, and vicinity well sounded out. 11.30 a. m. tugs *Blanche* and *Marion*, of Wilmington, N. C., arrived, and entered into some agreement with master for floating steamer. Westwood by ready to take hold. We had offered our services on arrival, but master wished first to talk with tugs regarding matter. After making a thorough examination of her situation the tug captains approached us with a proposition that as she was too big for them to think of handling alone, we should take the steamer's line and pull on the high water and one of them would endeavor to hold her head up to the wind while the other pulled also.

Accordingly, at 3 p. m. we got our anchor and steamed up alongside and took her line. After pulling until 6 p. m. and parting her line twice without starting the vessel, we discontinued operations for that tide, it having fallen too much for further work. During night consultations were held with tug

captains and it was decided very sensibly that we should do all the pulling and both tugs endeavor to hold her head up. On morning of 30th we again went to steamer and worked on the high water from 4 a. m. until 7 a. m., but unavailingly. Succeeded in turning her on her heel, but not floating her. We then lay off and anchored to wait for afternoon tide, which was the fuller tide.

During the morning watch the wrecking tug *Wm. Coley*, of New York, arrived on the scene. At this time we had swung steamer around several points, so that she headed east, but she still remained fast aft. *Coley* planted a big wrecking anchor off starboard bow and hove the cable taut on bow of steamer, then made fast alongside of her just before high water. We ran out our 9-inch hawser to steamer's bow, she having no line strong enough to stand the strain, and with two tugs to hold her head up to wind, and with *Coley* working alongside stranded steamer, we finally floated her at 6 p. m.

The tugs were small and of little power and experienced difficulty in even holding her head to windward. Twice our line was let go from steamer after we had started her, and when at last we did give her the final pull, which started her, we not only brought the steamer, but the three tugs as well, and also the big anchor planted by the wrecker. After we had floated her she let go our line and we hauled it in on board at once, so as to give the tugs a better opportunity to handle her. After seeing her engines started and ascertaining by a boarding officer, sent for the purpose, that she was uninjured, as far as could be told at the time by her not leaking and everything working smoothly, we saw her started for Newport News under her own steam, and then headed back for Wilmington to renew our coal supply.

It was conceded by the tug captains and also by the steamer's master that they never could have floated her alone, and when one compares our 2,600 horsepower with their combined 400, the concession seems at least tenable. As a matter of fact, the next day a bad swell was rolling in from the south-east, and the steamer would not have lasted long if she had been there.

Respectfully submitted.

O. S. WILLEY.

Captain, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, Commanding.

The claim of the Revenue-Cutter Service, as has been set forth in various reports concerning the pending bill or similar bills, is that it is the ocean police, and that its vessels are constantly cruising on the lookout for disasters to other vessels. What the Revenue-Cutter vessels actually do in the way of rendering assistance is shown by the preceding statements. What the Revenue-Cutter Service does not do in the way of rendering assistance is shown by the following statement of facts taken from the report of the Life-Saving Service for the last fiscal year:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, as shown by the annual report of the Life-Saving Service, there were on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts and on the Great Lakes 937 casualties to vessels.

On the Atlantic and Gulf coasts there were 162 disasters resulting in total loss to vessels and 329 disasters resulting in partial damage to vessels. On the same coasts 51 vessels foundered, 182 vessels stranded, 213 vessels collided, 35 vessels were on fire. Other vessels suffered from other disasters.

On the Pacific coast there were 51 disasters resulting in total loss to vessels and 48 disasters resulting in partial loss to vessels. Of these, 4 foundered, 63 stranded, 20 collided, 9 were on fire.

On the Great Lakes there were 44 disasters resulting in total loss to vessels and 212 disasters resulting in partial loss to vessels. Of these, 19 foundered, 80 stranded, 99 collided, 32 were on fire.

Of the above vessels, 12 foundered with loss of life, 15 stranded with loss of life, and 9 collided with loss of life.

Where were the revenue cutters when these disasters were happening?

The report of the committee in favor of the pending bill quotes a statement which is said to have been made by Admiral Melville before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In this report Admiral Melville is credited with using the following language relating to the Revenue-Cutter Service:

I have watched these vessels leave port upon the approach of a gale to patrol the coast in the hope of rendering assistance to any ships that might have been unfortunate enough to have been cast on the beach. \* \* \*

The work of the revenue marine is a more dangerous occupation than that of the Navy, because the duty of the first organization is to police the coast, while the Navy really polices the ocean. It is seldom that a ship is now lost at sea. It is cruising along the coast that is dangerous, and this is the special province of the revenue marine.

This is the strongest claim put forward in behalf of the Revenue-Cutter Service. It is a claim that has been persistently made. Admiral Melville has not been in a position where he could possibly have personal knowledge of the facts stated by him. He has been imposed upon by some one. The statements submitted above of actual cases of assistance rendered to "vessels in distress," as claimed by the Revenue-Cutter Service, will show whether they were rendered during or following a gale. But the intimation in the statement by Admiral Melville, as well as in the persistent claim of this service, is that its vessels are constantly cruising in time of storm as well as in quiet along the coast for the purpose of aiding any vessels in distress. The intimation is made that the Revenue-Cutter vessels are out at sea cruising along the coast nearly all of the time. According to Admiral Melville, that is their chief occupation.

But in the Revenue-Cutter Office are monthly statements from each Revenue-Cutter vessel showing the time during the month such vessel has been at anchor and the time under way, both expressed in days, hours, and minutes. Such statements also show the number of miles traveled or cruised each month.



Herewith submitted are compiled statements as to about half the vessels in the Revenue-Cutter Service; also a statement showing the number of miles cruised by each vessel in the service during the last fiscal year, and the location of each vessel:

Statement showing time of various revenue cutters at anchor and under way, respectively, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, expressed in days, hours, and minutes.

Name of vessel.	At anchor.			Under way.		
	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.
Algonquin (Wilmington).....	312	11	15	52	12	45
Calumet (New York).....	325	13	20	39	10	40
Chandler (Boston).....	339	3	0	25	21	0
Galveston (Galveston).....	356	17	0	8	7	0
Gresham (New York).....	328	9	10	36	14	50
Guthrie (Baltimore).....	292	9	35	72	14	25
Hudson (New York).....	320	17	45	44	6	15
Manhattan (New York).....	309	9	25	55	14	35
McCulloch.....	311	15	5	53	8	55
McLane (Key West).....	310	1	54	54	22	6
Morrill (Milwaukee).....	328	11	20	36	12	40
Onondaga (Philadelphia).....	306	0	43	58	23	17
Seminole (Boston).....	328	20	1	36	3	59
Seward (Mobile).....	345	13	0	19	11	0
Smith (New Orleans).....	348	22	5	16	1	55
Washington (Philadelphia).....	322	0	45	42	23	15
Windom (Baltimore).....	308	4	0	56	20	0
Winona (Mobile).....	324	20	40	40	3	20

Statement relating to various revenue cutters, showing number of days, hours, and minutes under way and the distance traveled under steam for each month of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

[Compiled from the monthly reports of the officers in charge of such revenue cutters.]

Month.	Steamer Algonquin.				Steamer Calumet.				Steamer Chandler.			
	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.
1900.												
July.....	2	6	25	553.6	3	23	10	856.5	2	6	30	436
August.....	3	5	17	855.9	3	17	10	802.5	2	8	0	448
September.....	10	11	20	2,734.6	3	12	35	761.25	2	16	0	512
October.....	8	5	40	1,909.8	3	0	55	656.25	2	16	0	512
November.....	1	21	35	468.6	3	1	0	657	2	6	0	240
December.....	2	20	0	955.1	3	2	5	846.75	2	6	0	432
1901.												
January.....	3	17	25	822.1	3	11	30	751.5	1	21	0	405
February.....	4	5	5	922.8	2	23	55	638.25	1	19	0	387
March.....	3	15	20	934.3	3	11	25	750.75	2	4	0	468
April.....	3	13	23	948.9	3	11	0	747	2	0	30	437
May.....	2	3	10	528.1	3	8	10	702.5	2	13	0	549
June.....	5	8	5	1,320.9	3	14	45	780.75	2	1	0	441
Total.....	52	12	45	13,014.7	39	10	40	8,951	25	21	0	5,267

Month.	Steamer Galveston.				Steamer Gresham.				Steamer Guthrie.			
	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.
1900.												
July.....	0	0	0	0	4	4	35	1,040	7	20	45	1,349
August.....	0	0	0	0	4	5	45	1,080	6	13	15	1,102
September.....	3	0	0	567.9	3	15	50	968	6	7	25	1,090
October.....	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	448	4	10	10	685
November.....	0	1	0	1.2	1	0	45	179	5	21	15	974
December.....	0	3	0	7	4	14	40	1,248	6	21	15	896
1901.												
January.....	0	0	0	0	4	13	5	1,219	5	21	10	854
February.....	0	0	0	0	4	8	45	1,270	5	5	20	753
March.....	0	0	0	0	4	17	0	1,268	5	15	50	855
April.....	1	11	0	350	4	11	30	350	5	6	45	881
May.....	2	11	0	526.5	0	1	40	7	7	19	45	961
June.....	1	5	0	266	1	9	15	364	7	13	30	1,127
Total.....	8	7	0	1,718.6	36	14	50	9,411	72	14	25	11,467

Month.	Steamer Hudson.				Steamer Manhattan.				Steamer McCulloch.			
	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.
1900.												
July.....	3	2	5	695	4	6	45	1,090	9	17	35	2,090.3
August.....	2	22	0	656	4	21	45	1,185	13	8	35	2,825
September.....	4	2	0	956	7	10	25	1,065	22	18	5	538
October.....	4	15	0	1,016	5	9	0	1,275	7	5	50	1,322.6

Statement relating to various revenue cutters, showing number of days, hours, and minutes under way and the distance traveled under steam for each month of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—Continued.

Month.	Steamer Hudson.				Steamer Manhattan.				Steamer McCulloch.			
	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.
1900.												
November.....	3	9	0	746	4	13	25	1,100	8	17	0	1,863
December.....	3	2	30	697	2	20	15	680	6	20	25	1,368.15
1901.												
January.....	2	22	0	661	4	9	15	1,055	0	0	45	1
February.....	3	15	0	805	2	17	0	650	3	7	15	374.8
March.....	4	0	0	897	4	7	0	1,030	0	3	50	26
April.....	4	5	0	926	4	10	45	1,065	0	7	30	62
May.....	4	7	40	958	5	6	15	1,260	0	14	25	108
June.....	3	18	0	807	5	2	45	1,220	0	7	40	67.5
Total.....	44	6	15	9,820	55	14	25	12,615	53	8	55	10,055.35

Month.	Steamer McLane.				Steamer Morrill.				Steamer Onondaga.			
	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.
1900.												
July.....	3	19	4	599	5	7	10	1,251.5	5	22	50	1,403.8
August.....	5	13	50	912	6	4	15	1,433.5	2	6	15	647.5
September.....	3	23	5	696	3	17	55	906.5	11	15	20	2,773.3
October.....	1	14	55	240	4	17	15	1,351	9	19	48	2,570.9
November.....	5	20	30	890.3	3	10	35	755	1	1	25	246.9
December.....	4	12	39	632.5	1	11	0	329	5	0	14	1,153.3
1901.												
January.....	6	22	40	1,083.6	0	0	0	0	4	16	40	1,111.1
February.....	4	22	18	842.6	0	0	0	0	6	18	10	1,490.9
March.....	4	20	10	932.7	0	0	0	0	5	4	52	1,253.4
April.....	3	2	15	479	2	7	55	524.6	0	1	40	10
May.....	4	17	45	774.1	3	11	25	957	2	16	40	607
June.....	5	0	55	805.4	5	21	10	1,584	2	19	23	714.1
Total.....	54	22	6	8,737.2	36	12	40	9,032.1	58	23	17	13,752.2

Month.	Steamer Seminole.				Steamer Seward.				Steamer Smith.			
	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.
1900.												
July.....	Not in commission.				2	3	0	345	0	0	30	2
August.....	Not in commission.				5	3	0	812	0	20	50	184
September.....	3	21	59	897.8	2	9	0	380	1	20	55	284
October.....	2	15	25	580.2	2	2	0	317	2	4	50	335
November.....	1	21	40	462.7	1	1	0	164	2	6	25	396
December.....	4	8	10	987.4	0	17	0	95	1	10	25	187
1901.												
January.....	5	15	15	1,367	1	13	0	237	2	7	30	334
February.....	5	15	40	1,394	0	20	0	126	1	6	50	163
March.....	5	5	5	1,340	0	20	0	124	2	0	10	293
April.....	1	18	0	425	1	12	0	229	1	2	40	171
May.....	2	0	0	526	1	7	0	223	0	11	20	76
June.....	3	2	45	780	0	0	0	0	0	5	30	7
Total.....	36	3	59	8,740.1	19	11	0	3,052	16	1	55	2,402

Month.	Steamer Washington.				Steamer Windom.				Steamer Winona.			
	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.	Days.	Hours.	Minutes.	Distance in miles.
1900.												
July.....	0	0	0	0	5	5	30	1,126.3	1	17	15	292
August.....	3	12	35	513	4	18	5	1,063.2	3	9	15	584
September.....	3	16	40	613	5	20	50	1,342.2	7	13	35	1,269
October.....	3	20	10	528	6	0	30	1,392.3	1	11	20	234
November.....	4	20	55	818	2	14	10	545.7	3	14	30	654
December.....	3	22	0	687	5	7	10	1,119.5	2	4	20	366
1901.												
January.....	4	2	30	655	6	15	15	1,470.8	3	14	35	617
February.....	3	6	29	411	5	22	40	1,258.5	2	13	5	417
March.....	3	14	35	493	6	16	35	1,527.3	1	0	0	164
April.....	4	20	30	734	3	1	55	644	2	18	35	446
May.....	4	0	5	640	0	1	0	3	4	15	35	769
June.....	3	7	5	531	4	16	30	1,040.8	5	15	15	876
Total.....	42	23	15	6,623	53	20	0	12,533.6	40	3	20	6,688

Statement of total number of miles cruised by revenue cutters for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

Steamer.	Number of miles.	Where located.
Algonquin	13,014.7	Wilmington, N. C.
Bear	8,583.1	Arctic cruise.
Boutwell	3,598.5	Newbern, N. C.
Calumet	8,951	New York, N. Y.
Chandler	5,267	Boston, Mass.
Chase	2,445.3	On practice cruise.
Dallas	10,443.8	New London, Conn.
Dexter	9,430.9	New Bedford, Mass.
Fessenden	5,393	Detroit, Mich.
Forward	4,903.7	Charleston, S. C.
Galveston	1,372.6	Galveston, Tex.
Golden Gate	7,412.5	San Francisco, Cal.
Grant	18,488.5	Port Townsend, Wash.
Gresham	9,406	New York City, N. Y.
Guard	288	Port Townsend, Wash.
Guthrie	11,467	Baltimore, Md.
Hamilton	7,374	Savannah, Ga.
Hartley	5,131	Harbor duty, San Francisco.
Hudson	9,820	New York, N. Y.
Manhattan	12,595	Do.
Manning	16,793.9	Alaskan cruise.
McCulloch	10,664.35	San Francisco and Alaskan cruise.
McLane	8,737.2	Key West, Fla.
Morrill	9,062.1	Milwaukee, Wis.
Onondaga	13,752.2	Philadelphia, Pa.
Penrose	2,730.03	Pensacola, Fla.
Perry	10,904.9	Port Townsend, Wash.
Rush	11,064.1	Sitka, Alaska.
Scout	706	Port Townsend, Wash.
Seward	3,052	Mobile, Ala., harbor duty.
Smith	2,402	New Orleans, La.
Sperry	2,527	Patchogue, N. Y.
Tybee	3,356	Savannah, Ga.
Washington	6,623	Philadelphia, Pa.
Windom	12,533.6	Baltimore, Md.
Winona	6,688	Mobile, Ala.
Woodbury	8,777.7	Portland, Me.
Nunivak	2,050	Yukon River, Alaska.
Seminole	8,740.1	Boston, Mass.
Thetis	109.8	Alaskan cruise.
Total	237,810.58	

In addition there was total cruising of 3,554.7 miles in Life-Saving Service.

#### ASSIGNMENT OF DUTY OF REVENUE-CUTTER OFFICERS.

By the register of the Revenue-Cutter Service issued July 1, 1901, the following is shown:

Of the 37 captains, 20 captains are on board revenue cutters, 1 is on practice ship *Chase*, 6 are on duty with the Life-Saving Service, 4 are on waiting orders, and 6 are on other shore duty.

Of the 37 first lieutenants, 25 are on board revenue cutters, 4 are with the Life-Saving Service, 8 are on other special duty.

Of the second lieutenants, 6 are on special duty, not on board revenue cutters.

On the practice ship *Chase*, on practice cruise, there are 1 captain, 2 second lieutenants, 2 third lieutenants, 12 cadets.

The joint duties of the Revenue-Cutter Service, as set forth in the published regulations (paragraph 98) are, as fixed by law, the following:

1. The protection of the customs revenue.
2. The assistance of vessels in distress.
3. The enforcement of the laws pertaining to the quarantine.
4. The enforcement of the neutrality laws.
5. The enforcement of the navigation and other laws covering merchant vessels.
6. The protection of merchant vessels from piratical attacks and the suppression of piracy.
7. The protection of the seal fisheries and seal-otter hunting grounds in Alaska.
8. The protection of wrecked property.
9. The protection of the timber reserves of the United States against depredations.
10. The suppression of illegal traffic in firearms, ammunition, and spirits in Alaska.
11. The suppression of the slave trade.
12. The suppression of mutinies on board merchant vessels.
13. The superintendence of the construction of life-saving stations.
14. The inspection and drilling of crews of life-saving stations.
15. The assisting of the Commission of Fish and Fisheries.
16. The enforcement of the provision of law in regard to the anchorage of vessels in the ports of New York and Chicago.
17. The cooperation with the Navy when directed by the President.
18. The establishment and maintenance of a refuge station at or near Point Barrow, Alaska.

#### ALLOWANCES TO REVENUE-CUTTER OFFICERS.

Paragraph 868, Revenue-Cutter Service regulations, provides: Officers on public duty, where there are no public quarters assigned them, will be paid commutation therefor at the following rates:

Captains, per month, \$40.

First lieutenants and chief engineers, per month, \$30.

Second lieutenants and first assistant engineers, per month, \$25.

Third lieutenants and second assistant engineers, per month, \$20.

Paragraph 870 provides:

Each officer of the Revenue-Cutter Service is entitled to one navy ration or to commutation therefor while on duty.

#### APPOINTMENTS TO REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Paragraph 6 of the regulations provides that no person shall be originally appointed in the service to a higher grade than cadet or second assistant engineer.

Paragraph 7, that no candidate for appointment of cadet shall be less than 18 nor more than 23 years of age.

Paragraph 8, that no candidate for position of second assistant engineer shall be less than 21 nor more than 28 years old.

#### NO PUNISHMENT FOR DESEDITION.

In a letter from Secretary Gage to Senator FRYE, chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate, dated February 26, 1898, relating to the Revenue-Cutter Service, Secretary Gage said:

There is now no authority for the apprehension of deserters from the Revenue-Cutter Service; no mode or method by which the crime of mutiny or desertion can be punished. Under existing conditions a man may sign articles of enlistment one day and desert the Service the next and defy arrest for his crime, a condition unknown to any other organized service under Government or even the merchant marine.

#### TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, Washington, March 28, 1902.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Agreeably to the request contained in your note of the 26th instant, I inclose copies of the detailed reports of the operations of the revenue steamer *Galveston* during and subsequent to the hurricane which swept over the city of that name September 8, 1900.

You will observe that only 38 persons are referred in the detailed reports as having been rescued. The abstract journal of the vessel, however, which is a consolidated monthly report of the operations of the vessel for the month, shows 40 lives to have been saved.

Respectfully,

C. F. SHOEMAKER.

Captain, Revenue-Cutter Service, Chief of Division.

U. S. S. GALVESTON, Galveston, Tex., September 11, 1900.

C. T. BRIAN,

First Lieutenant, R. C. S., Commanding U. S. S. Galveston.

SIR: I have the honor to respectfully report that, at 12 o'clock on the 9th instant, on receiving the information that there were still people in the western part of the city who had not been rescued, and after obtaining your permission to take the cutter and go to their assistance, I took a boat's crew from the ship, composed of the following men: Charles Lincoln, boatswain; T. Olsen, coxswain; U. Idstrom, third oiler; C. Wichelhaus, seaman; H. Gosch, ordinary seaman; W. Miether, bugler, and one man from shore who went with us to show us the way. I would state that every man in the crew performed his duty in every way highly satisfactory.

I rowed up the bay about 4 miles and then started across the flooded portion of the city, and after dragging the boat over the shoal places I at last succeeded in reaching a freight car, where two women and two children had taken refuge. I took them into the boat, and after rowing and dragging the boat about, and finding no more people in trouble, I started back to the ship. On the way I picked up three dead bodies and towed them in and reported them to the proper authorities. I brought the people aboard ship and gave them food and shelter. One of the women being injured, I made a stretcher for her and carried her to the hospital with the help of the crew.

I would also state that on the morning of the 10th instant, at your direction, I took cutter and a crew from the ship and picked up eight dead bodies and towed them in to the wharf.

I would also inform you that I have issued 300 rations to the people we have taken care of, and would request you to ask the Department to authorize the purchasing of 300 extra rations from the contractor, to replenish those issued.

Respectfully submitted.

F. W. SMITH,

Third Lieutenant, Revenue-Cutter Service, Acting Executive Officer.

Respectfully submitted.

CHAS. T. BRIAN,

First Lieutenant, Revenue-Cutter Service, Commanding.

U. S. S. GALVESTON, Galveston, Tex., September, 1900.

Hon. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have to report that on the 8th instant a hurricane of great violence visited this place, doing untold damage, great loss of life, and causing great distress.

At 4 the water commenced to rise over the wharves so rapidly that it was impossible for the people to leave the house on the bay shore. Sent the cutter and crew in charge of Second Asst. Engineer C. S. Root (as it was impossible to spare Lieutenant Smith, as it took our attention to look out for the vessel) to render what assistance he could. He brought three families on board, and moved the rest to places of safety.

The boat returned at 1 a. m. September 9. Lieutenant Smith volunteered to take boat and rescue 2 women and 2 children in a box car up the bay. The boat returned with rescue party. We fed and gave shelter to 4 families, and issued 300 rations and water to those that asked for assistance, as it was impossible to buy any provisions as nearly 70 per cent of the residences were washed and blown down. The waterworks were damaged. The cistern water was ruined by salt water. In consequence fresh water is very scarce. Up to date the city authorities estimate the deaths nearly 5,000. We had no casualties on board. The crew behaved and worked splendidly, and responded promptly to every call.

Respectfully, yours,

CHAS. T. BRIAN,

First Lieutenant, Revenue-Cutter Service, Commanding.



U. S. S. GALVESTON, Galveston, Tex., September 11, 1900.

First Lieut. CHARLES T. BRIAN, R. C. S.,  
Commanding U. S. S. Galveston.

SIR: I have the honor to submit the following report of the part taken by eight men from this vessel in rescuing some of the inhabitants of this city from drowning during the hurricane that was raging here on the afternoon and evening of the 8th instant:

I left the ship with your permission at 4 p. m. in charge of the cutter, manned by the following volunteer crew: G. Jeffas, gunner; J. Anderson, carpenter; N. Cormack, master at arms; T. Olsen, coxswain; W. Gardiner, oiler (third class); W. Idstrom, oiler (third class); B. Rafailovich, fireman; J. Bierman, ordinary seaman.

I dragged the boat from the ship across the railway tracks and launched her on Fourteenth street. Being informed that there were women and children to the east of Fourteenth street in danger of drowning, I turned to the east on avenue A and succeeded in embarking 13 persons from two houses on that street between Thirteenth and Fourteenth streets. These houses were afterwards destroyed by the wind and sea. The boat being loaded as deep as I deemed advisable under the circumstances, I returned to the ship and placed these people aboard, arriving alongside at 4.50 p. m.

I left at 5 p. m. to render further assistance. On arriving at the corner of Fourteenth street and Avenue A, I found a current had commenced running from east to west with a speed of from 5 to 6 knots per hour, and this current, together with the high wind, made the boat almost unmanageable, pulling 6 oars.

I endeavored to pull to the eastward, but was unable to make headway. All hands jumped overboard and tried to tow the boat to windward by means of the painter, but finding the water up to our necks, and being unable to make way against the current, the oars were again manned, and I gradually drifted to the westward along avenue A. At a point midway between Fourteenth and Fifteenth streets, I picked up four women and two men from a skiff which had foundered about 300 feet to the eastward and were being rapidly swept into the bay.

About this time, the roof of the grain elevator at the foot of Fourteenth street blew off, and the boat narrowly escaped being crushed by flying debris. At the corner of Fifteenth street and avenue A, I caught a turn with boat's painter around a telegraph pole, thus preventing the boat from being driven farther to the westward. By this time the wind had so increased that oars were of no use and no further attempt was made to use them. By running lines the boat was warped to a small frame house between avenues A and B on Fifteenth street, and I took aboard four aged people (two women and two men). I then warped the boat to the corner of avenue B and Fifteenth street, dropped down to the westward along avenue B as far as Seventeenth street, but saw no one who needed assistance.

I then warped the boat to a brick building on the northeast corner of Avenue C and Seventeenth street and landed the passengers, this being the safest place I was able to reach. The lower floor of this two-story building was occupied by a grocer, and was crowded by refugees. I was there informed that there were several people in great danger on Avenue C between Fifteenth and Seventeenth streets. I took possession of a coil of 60 fathoms of 1½-inch sisal rope (which was part of the grocer's stock) to assist in working the boat to the eastward and gave a receipt of the same. Avenue C at this time was full of floating debris and swimming cattle. The wind was blowing so hard it was impossible to look to windward.

Ordinary Seaman J. Bierman took the end of the new coil of line in his teeth, swam as far to the eastward as he could draw the line, and made it fast to a telegraph pole which was about midway between Sixteenth and Seventeenth streets on Avenue C. Making fast to the pole I attempted to run a line farther to the eastward, but the wind, current, and wreckage prevented, so was reluctantly compelled to give it up. I took aboard the occupants of three frame houses at this point (11 persons in all). It was now so dark that it was impossible to see, and I was compelled to desist from the work of rescue.

The boat being full, I dropped back to the before-mentioned brick store and landed our passengers. It being impossible to return to the ship, and not knowing how long we should have to remain in the boat, I took possession of a box of soda biscuit. There being no fresh water to be had, and as all the men were thirsty, I took a large bottle of pickles, thinking the vinegar would help to quench their thirst.

The crew of the boat took nothing without my order. I gave receipts for the articles just mentioned. I had previously noticed a one-story brick warehouse on the east side of Seventeenth street, between avenues B and C, quite isolated from other buildings, and thinking it might be possible to get through the large double front door with the boat, with great difficulty the boat was warped alongside the buildings, only to find that the door was partly blocked with wreckage. I made the boat fast outside the building; all hands went overboard, swam inside, and found a place of refuge on top of some cases of merchandise. The water inside this building was about 10 feet deep at the time we entered, the surface being about 4 feet below the top of the door and rising slowly. A close watch was kept on the water, the idea being to take to the boat again in case we were in danger of being imprisoned by the rise of the water.

Being in this building undoubtedly saved us from being badly injured, if not killed, as the hurricane was at its height at 9.30 p. m., the boat being struck by numerous pieces of brick, shale, etc. At 10.30 the water began to fall rapidly, going down about 3 feet in half an hour. The wind and current having diminished so that I was able to handle the boat with the oars, I again started out at 11.15 p. m. No one could be seen who needed assistance, so I pulled for the ship. Our way was blocked when we arrived within 100 yards of the ship by wrecked freight cars and houses. I moored the boat securely, head and stern, took all movable equipment with me, and arrived on board, all members of the boat's crew being present and unhurt at 12.20 a. m. on the 9th instant.

I took possession of the rope and food heretofore mentioned only because they were urgently needed and because I felt sure, under the circumstances, you would approve of my action. I inclose a bill for the above articles. (See inclosure No. 1).

The men composing the boat's crew behaved with the greatest bravery and in a manner highly creditable to the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States. I feel that I must make special mention of the conspicuous bravery of Ordinary Seaman J. Bierman, who, at the great risk of his life, repeatedly swam for long distances with lines, thus enabling me to move the boat after oars became useless.

Respectfully submitted.

CHAS. S. ROOT,

Second Assistant Engineer, Revenue-Cutter Service.

CHAS. T. BRIAN,

First Lieutenant, Revenue-Cutter Service, Commanding.

#### STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE OFFICIAL REGISTER.

[Act of Congress approved January 12, 1895.]

To enable the officer charged with the duty of preparing the Official Register of the United States to publish the same, the Secretary of the Senate

the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the head of each executive department of the Government, and the chief of each and every bureau, office, commission, or institution not embraced in an executive department, in connection with which salaries are paid from the Treasury of the United States, shall, on the 1st day of July in each year in which a new Congress is to assemble, cause to be filed with the Secretary of the Interior a full and complete list of all officers, agents, clerks, and other employees of said department, bureau, office, commission, or institution connected with the legislative, executive, or judicial service of the Government, or paid from the United States Treasury, including military and naval officers of the United States, cadets, and midshipmen.

Said list shall exhibit the salary, compensation, and emoluments allowed to each of said officers, agents, clerks, and other employees, the State or county in which he was born, the State or Territory and Congressional district and county of which he is a resident and from which he was appointed to office, and where employed.

A list of the names, force, and condition of all ships and vessels belonging to the United States, and when and where built, shall also be filed with the Secretary of the Interior by the heads of the departments having supervision of such ships and vessels for incorporation in the Official Register.

It will be noticed that the foregoing requirements regarding the Blue Book require all the employees of the Government to be inserted therein, including military and naval officers. By legal construction the words "including military and naval officers" would exclude the enlisted men of the Army and Navy, but even then the Navy reports as officers the names, etc., of its warrant officers, such as boatswains, gunners, carpenters, warrant machinists, etc., and both Army and Navy report all of the civil employees, including the employees in the Engineering Department of the Army and at the naval yards and naval stations of the Navy.

While other branches of the Government which have control of vessels, such as the Light-House Service, the Fish Commission, the Army Transport Service, etc., furnished a complete list of all the employees in such services for publication in the Blue Book, the Revenue-Cutter Service is the one branch of the Government service which refuses or neglects to furnish such information, although there are now more than 1,000 employees of that service besides the commissioned officers, and although there are several hundred officers similar to the warrant officers reported by the Navy in the Blue Book, such as boatswains, gunners, carpenters, etc.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. OLMSTED reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for two weeks, on account of important business. And then, on motion of Mr. HEPBURN (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter to the Chief of Engineers, draft of a resolution authorizing certain payments to employees on the Government Printing Office building—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13084) granting an increase of pension to John Middleton, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSS: A bill (H. R. 13165) for the erection of a public building at Bowling Green, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 13166) to amend section 9 of the act of February 2, 1901, entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington (by request): A bill (H. R. 13167) to prevent grazing on the public lands of the United States in the State of Washington east of the summit of the Cascade Mountains between the 1st day of December of any year and the 31st day of March following—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13168) to establish an additional life-saving station on Monomoy Island, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 13169) relating to third and fourth class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 13170) to amend section 941 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by act approved March 3, 1899—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 13171) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Creek tribe of Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13172) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes of Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 13173) to provide for the erection of a public building at Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MCCALL: A bill (H. R. 13204) to provide for refunding taxes paid upon legacies and bequests for uses of a religious, charitable, or educational character, for the encouragement of art, and so forth, under the act of June 13, 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 13174) granting an increase of pension to Ransford T. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 13175) to provide medals for the Port Hudson volunteer forlorn-hope storming column of June 15, 1863—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13176) for the relief of the heirs of the late Thomas H. Brierly, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 13177) granting an increase of pension to John W. Worley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LASSITER: A bill (H. R. 13178) granting a pension to William F. Bowden—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 13179) granting an increase of pension to Smith Bilderback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 13180) granting a pension to Adam Maurer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13181) granting an increase of pension to John J. Reeder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13182) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13183) granting an increase of pension to George R. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13184) granting an increase of pension to Philip Gavin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13185) granting an increase of pension to David Peters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13186) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13187) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Shoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13188) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Edwin C. Winchester, alias Willis E. Jackson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13189) granting a pension to Henry C. Cowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 13190) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Jacobs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 13191) granting an increase of pension to Harvey L. Rose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 13192) granting an increase of pension to Lionel O. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13193) granting an increase of pension to George N. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13194) granting increase of pension to Lewis F. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 13195) granting an increase of pension to David R. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13196) to correct the record of Wilson W. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 13197) granting an increase of pension to William Nichol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13198) granting an increase of pension to George Gaylord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 13199) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 13200) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Greely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13201) granting an increase of pension to George Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 13202) granting a pension to Albert T. Weathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 13203) for the relief of Jeremiah Walton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VREELAND: A resolution (H. Res. 184) concerning the payment to Mrs. Jessie A. Glenn, widow of Hon. W. J. Glenn, late Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, certain moneys out of the contingent fund—to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Resolution of Polish-American citizens of Homestead, favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BELL: Resolutions of Denver Branch Society of Engineers, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CROMER: Petition of the National Hay Association, Winchester, Ind., favoring House bill 8337 and Senate bill 3575, amending the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Protest of the Manufacturers' Association of New York against the passage of Senate bill 1118—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of same body, favoring House bill 9056, known as the Babcock bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of same body, favoring the construction of naval vessels at Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Wholesale Grocers' Association of New York and vicinity, regarding the Indian warehouse in New York—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of Polish societies of Wilmerding, Braddock, Claridge, and West Pittsburg, Pa., favoring House bill 16, for the erection of an equestrian statue of the late General Pulaski at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Order of Railway Conductors of Columbia, Pa., and Order of Railway Trainmen of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of Building Trades Council of New York, urging legislation to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Petition of the Basin Miners' Union, of Basin, Mont., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EMERSON: Letter from Gas Engine and Power Company, New York City, protesting against the passage of House bill 3076, known as the eight-hour bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FLEMING: Resolutions of Augusta Division, No. 202, Order of Railway Conductors, of Augusta, and Division No. 368, of Atlanta, Ga., Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of the Congregational Church of Pocatone, Ill., for legislation against the liquor traffic—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HULL: Communication of William H. Van Name, Port Richmond, Staten Island, in relation to Senate bill 2172—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: Paper to accompany House bill 11445, granting a pension to James Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 8560, to amend the military record of James A. Gregg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of J. S. Wyckoff and many other citizens of Wichita, Kans., favoring extension of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.



Also, letter of Justin M. Cooper, to accompany House bill 1068, for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Lead City Miners' Union, of Lead, S. Dak., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of the Iroquois Club, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Virginia State Good Roads Convention, Richmond, Va., in favor of liberal appropriations for the Good Roads Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Massachusetts State Board of Trade, favoring the appointment of a commission to study and report upon the industrial and commercial conditions in China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McCLEARY: Resolutions of Minnesota State Encampment, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring a more liberal interpretation of the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Olmsted (Minn.) Good Roads Association, in favor of liberal appropriations for the Good Roads Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the St. Paul (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring liberal appropriations for the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill 11449, granting an increase of pension to Otto Holtzworth—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: Petitions of Branches Polish National Alliance at Nanticoke and Glenlyon, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. Powers of Maine: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the correction of the military record of Edwin C. Winchester, alias Willis E. Jackson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13189, for the relief of Henry R. Cowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: Protest of merchants of Meadville, Mo., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of a mass meeting of the Utah volunteers, favoring bill to allow travel pay from Manila, P. I., to San Francisco to those who enlisted on call for volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany bill to restore David B. Jeffers to the Army of the United States and place him on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Resolutions of Michigan State Grange against the ship subsidy bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNOOK: Papers to accompany House bill 13192, granting a pension to Lionel O. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13194, granting a pension to Lewis F. Ross—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 13193, granting an increase of pension to George N. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Piano and Organ Workers' Union of Derby, Conn., to exclude Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Resolutions of Safety Lodge, No. 142, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, for the passage of House bill 9330, for a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Safety Lodge, No. 142, Locomotive Firemen; Division No. 26, Order of Railway Conductors; Machinists' Lodge No. 105; Journeymen Tailors' Union, all of Toledo, Ohio, and Retail Clerks' Union No. 239, of Bowling Green, Ohio, favoring more restrictive immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of Branch No. 543, Pottstown, Pa., Polish National Alliance, favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Hagerstown (Pa.) Circle, No. 37, Brotherhood of the Union, in favor of a national park at Valley Forge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODS: Petition of the State Council of California, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restrictive immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Order of Railroad Conductors No. 195, Sacramento, Cal., favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, March 31, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

## PACIFIC RAILROADS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 18th instant, a statement of the traffic relations between the railroads that connect the waters of the Pacific Ocean and the Government of the United States, with a reference to the statutes upon which such relations have been conducted, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads, and ordered to be printed.

## LOTS IN THE CITY OF WASHINGTON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in relation to Senate bill 4496, to confirm title to lots 3, 4, and 5, in square 979, in Washington, D. C., and also a copy of a letter from Col. Theodore A. Bingham, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in the city of Washington, relative to a bill of the House of Representatives on the same subject; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 2273) granting a pension to Martha A. DeLamarter;

A bill (H. R. 10486) granting a pension to Alida Payne;

A bill (H. R. 11418) granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles; and

A bill (H. R. 12315) granting an increase of pension to James Todd.

The message also announced that the House had passed with amendments the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 1172) granting an increase of pension to Catharine F. Edmunds;

A bill (S. 2371) granting a pension to Andrew J. Felt;

A bill (S. 2976) granting an increase of pension to Edward Thompson;

A bill (S. 3743) granting an increase of pension to Frances Gurlley Elderkin; and

A bill (S. 4071) granting an increase of pension to George C. Tillman.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 6) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Stone;

A bill (S. 13) granting an increase of pension to George Daniels;

A bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Emory S. Foster;

A bill (S. 965) granting a pension to Eliza B. Gamble;

A bill (S. 1039) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel C. Goodwin;

A bill (S. 1095) granting an increase of pension to Mary Morgan;

A bill (S. 1264) granting an increase of pension to Torgus Haraldson;

A bill (S. 1289) granting an increase of pension to Julius W. Clark;

A bill (S. 1630) granting an increase of pension to Ella R. Graham;

A bill (S. 1681) granting an increase of pension to Maria Louisa Michie;

A bill (S. 1872) granting an increase of pension to Abbie George;

A bill (S. 1924) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Feneran;

A bill (S. 1942) granting an increase of pension to Kate H. Clements;

A bill (S. 1967) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Freeman;

A bill (S. 1979) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Howard;